

BENJAMIN'S BIRTH, THE ABSENCE OF JERUSALEM, AND THE INSERTION OF BETHLEHEM IN GEN 35,16-21*

The Jacob narrative is considered paramount in the literary scope of Genesis. Located between the narratives of Abraham (Genesis 12–25) and Isaac (Genesis 25–28) and that of Joseph (Genesis 37; 39–50), the Jacob narrative (Genesis 28–35) serves centrally to bridge these literary blocks together. God blessed Abraham with offspring (Gen 22,17, non-P), and this same blessing was delivered to Isaac (26,4, non-P). However, the crucial event fulfilling Isaac's blessing was described as Jacob's genealogical reports (29,31 – 30,24 and 35,22-26). Jacob's twelve sons eventually became the twelve ancestors of the twelve tribes of Israel, and Jacob gained the specific name, Israel.

The following two stories — the tradition of Bethel (Gen 28,10-22 and 35,1-15) as well as Benjamin's nativity and Rachel's death (Gen 35,16-21) — are pivotal points in the Jacob narrative since their position reveals a pattern of *inclusio* based on Jacob's departure and return ¹. The former

* A preliminary version of this article was presented in one of the SNF Sinergia Project Meetings held in Tel Aviv, Israel (December, 2016), under the title of “The History of the Pentateuch: Combining Literary and Archaeological Approaches”. I acknowledge the financial support of Swiss National Fund (SNF) and the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Korea and the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF-2021S1A5B5A17052540) for conducting this project and writing this manuscript. I wish to thank Professors Konrad Schmid (Universität Zürich), Christophe Nihan (Université de Lausanne), Thomas Römer (Collège de France), Israel Finkelstein (Haifa University), Oded Lipschits (Tel Aviv University), and Koog P. Hong (Yonsei University) for their valuable comments and suggestions. If there are any mistakes and errors in this work, they are completely my own.

¹ The documentarians and neo-documentarians have viewed the pre-priestly “sources” within a large portion of the Jacob narrative — except for the Priestly source — as very old stories. J. WELLHAUSEN, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der Historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (Berlin ³1899) 30-48; J.E. CARPENTER – G. HARFORD, *The Composition of the Hexateuch* (New York 1902) 200-206, 215-227, 511-512; S.R. DRIVER, *The Book of Genesis* (London 1904) 262-312; J. SKINNER, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis* (ICC; Edinburgh 1910) 375-427; T.L. YOREH, *The First Book of God* (BZAW 402; Berlin 2010) 79-117, 257-258; J.S. BADEN, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*. Renewing the Documentary Hypothesis (New Haven, CT 2012) 17-18, 21-22, 48-72. Other scholars — the supporters of the supplementary hypothesis about the composition history of the Pentateuch — have also argued that even though the accurate date of composition cannot be ascertained, the early stage of the Jakob-Esau-Laban *Geschichte* was composed prior to the conquest of Samaria: E. BLUM, *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte* (WMANT 57; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1984) 5-223; D.M. CARR, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*. Historical and Literary Approaches (Louisville, KY 1996) 256-271, 298-300; R.G. KRATZ, *The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament* (London 2005) 268-274, 323;

story states that a cult at Bethel was firmly established by Jacob, whose tradition was rooted in this crucial shrine. The latter story reports that Rachel died *en route* from Bethel to Ephrath near Bethlehem; after she died giving birth to Benjamin, Jacob did not carry her corpse to Machpelah but instead left it in a roadside grave. In particular, the Jacob story ends in Gen 35,16-21, which recounts the conclusion of his journey. Gen 35,16-21 describes the birth of Benjamin and Rachel's death and is clearly different from Gen 28,10-22 (non-P) and 35,1-6* as well as 35,7-8 (non-P) and 35,9-15 (P), all of which have ties to the cult of Bethel. In this article, I evaluate the composition history of Gen 35,16-21 by applying historical-geographical and archaeological analysis to the text.

Researchers have long recognized the unique composition of the story in Gen 35,16-21 with its adjacent accounts and its later editorial features ². However, previous attempts to unravel its formation history have not been generally accepted. Documentarians have affirmed that 35,16-21 (non-P) is generally affiliated with the so-called E source but is akin to J in style and language ³; this made it difficult for scholars to accurately date 35,16-21, although they generally concur that 35,16-21 preserves an old memory ⁴. Recently, scholars have rejected the above source-critical hypothesis but remain divided among four schools of thought regarding the placement of 35,16-21 within the composition history of Genesis: (1) an etiological memory of Benjamin's birth and the matriarch's sepulcher (Proto-Yahwistic composition) ⁵; 2) the Judean scribal activities explaining the location of Rachel's tomb in the Neo-Babylonian period ⁶;

K. SCHMID, *Genesis and the Moses Story*. Israel's Dual Origins in the Hebrew Bible (Siphut 3; Winona Lake, IN 2010) 97-117; I. FINKELSTEIN – T. RÖMER, "Comments on the Historical Background of the Jacob Narrative in Genesis", *ZAW* 126 (2014) 317-338; M.A. SWEENEY, "The Jacob Narratives: An Ephraimitic Text", *CBQ* 78 (2016) 236-255. Alternatively, Schmid, Van Seters, and Na'aman argued that a coherent non-P Jacob story was composed by an exilic period Judean historian: H.H. SCHMID, *Der sogenannte Jahwist*. Beobachtungen und Fragen zur Pentateuchforschung (Zürich 1976); J. VAN SETERS, *Prologue to History*. The Yahwist as Historian in Genesis (Louisville, KY 1992) 277-310; N. NA'AMAN, "The Jacob Story and the Formation of Biblical Israel", *TA* 41 (2014) 95-125.

² E.g. G. VON RAD, *Genesis*. A Commentary, Rev. ed. (OTL; Philadelphia, PA 1972) 340.

³ E.g. SKINNER, *Genesis*, 426-427; E.A. SPEISER, *Genesis*. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB 1; New York 1964) 272-275; R. DAVIDSON, *Genesis 12-50* (Cambridge 1979) 202-205; YOREH, *First Book*, 110-111, 257-258; BADEN, *Composition of the Pentateuch*, 236-237.

⁴ DRIVER, *Genesis*, 310-311; C. WESTERMANN, *Genesis 12-36*. A Commentary (Minneapolis, MN 1985) 549, 554; G. WENHAM, *Genesis 16-50* (WBC 2; Dallas, TX 1994) 323.

⁵ KRATZ, *Composition*, 269, 273, 323.

⁶ NA'AMAN, "Jacob Story", 95-125.

3) a composite work written in the post-exilic Judean context ⁷; and 4) part of the post-Priestly literary product in the last stage of the Pentateuchal composition ⁸.

Finkelstein and Römer use historical and archaeological sources to suggest that the dates of composition of the Patriarchal stories should be reassessed based on the historical realities discernible within them ⁹. The essence of their proposal is that by employing archaeological data in conjunction with historical-critical approaches to biblical accounts, their individual historical background may be revealed. Following this premise, I test whether Gen 35,16-21 can serve as a case study to confirm the value of this kind of investigation.

In this paper, I indicate the following key narrative elements. (1) Benjamin's birth in the land of Canaan in Gen 35,18 (non-P), which stands in contrast to that of his brothers and to the information in 35,23-26 (P). (2) The sudden journey of Jacob's family from Bethel, which was likely their residence, to Ephrath. (3) A specific mention of a recondite place of Migdal-'eder, which alludes to a designation of Jerusalem whose political status was significant during the biblical periods. (4) A geographical oddity in the order of the localities mentioned in the text: Bethel (v.16); Ephrath (v.19a), Migdal-'eder (v. 21). (5) The function of a seemingly abrupt mention of Bethlehem in 35,19b. (6) The mentioned localities converging upon the territory of Benjamin, Jerusalem and Bethlehem, despite the importance of the northern region of Israel.

By reassessing the above issues, I argue that the fundamental story of Gen 35,16-21 was a Benjaminite sixth-century tradition, and that by inserting 35,19b a mid-Persian Judean scribe reworked this sixth-century tradition, and thus tried to "re-compose" the past once and for all.

⁷ J. BLENKINSOPP, "Benjamin Traditions Read in the Early Achaemenid Period", *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period* (eds. O. LIPSCHITS – M. OEMING) (Winona Lake, IN 2006) 629-645; J. BRIEND, "Genèse 35,16-22a", *Jacob. Commentaire à plusieurs voix de / Ein mehrstimmiger Kommentar zu / A Plural Commentary of Gen. 25–36. Mélanges offerts à Albert de Pury* (eds. J.-D. MACCHI – T. RÖMER) (Le Monde de la Bible 44; Genève 2001) 267-275, here 271.

⁸ E. BLUM, "The Jacob Tradition", *The Book of Genesis. Composition, Reception, and Interpretation* (eds. C.A. EVANS – J.N. LOHR – D.L. PETERSEN) (VTSup 152; Leiden 2012) 181-212, here 186, 192-194; FINKELSTEIN – RÖMER, "Historical Background of the Jacob Narrative", 337-338.

⁹ I. FINKELSTEIN – T. RÖMER, "Comments on the Historical Background of the Abraham Narrative: Between 'Realia' and 'Exegetica'", *HeBAI* 3 (2014) 3-23; FINKELSTEIN – RÖMER, "Historical Background of the Jacob Narrative", 317-338.

I. THE PROBLEM OF THE IDENTIFICATION OF EPHRATH:
REFLECTIONS ON TWO DIFFERENT LOCATIONS OF EPHRATH
FOR BENJAMIN'S BIRTHPLACE

It is widely accepted that the following pivotal areas of northern Israel are firmly embedded in most of the Jacob narrative: Bethel (Genesis 28–35), Shechem (Genesis 34), central Gilead (Genesis 32–33), and Aram (Genesis 29–31). For this reason, many scholars believe that the Jacob cycle has been derived from northern Israel's block of literature echoing eighth-century realities¹⁰. This study follows this broadly accepted theory. However, contrary to expectations, scholarly works have occasionally neglected the fact that the entire Jacob narrative was not solely based on northern Israelite toponyms. As Na'aman argues, Genesis 28 and 35 (non-P texts) state that several sites in Judah — namely, Beer-sheba (Gen 26,23.33; 28,10), Bethlehem (35,19), Hebron (35,27), and so on — are similarly featured in the Jacob narrative¹¹. Genesis 28 and 35 (the beginning and ending frame of the itinerary within the story of Jacob and thus marking an *inclusio*) envelope the fundamental backbone of the Jacob story (Genesis 29–34). Cautious readers may find that Shechem, Bethel, and Aram, as the spatial settings, play pivotal roles in developing the important narrative cycle in Genesis 28–35, whereas Beersheba, Bethlehem, and Hebron are mentioned only in passing. In this regard, one should ask why these Judean toponyms are embedded in Genesis 28 and 35, and how they function in the process of the composition of Genesis.

Gen 35,16-21 reports that Benjamin was born (vv. 17-18) immediately before Jacob's arrival at Ephrath and after his departure from Bethel (v. 16), that Rachel died (v. 19) and was buried there (vv. 19-20), and that Jacob continued his journey to Migdal-'eder (v. 21). First and foremost, Gen 35,19b (also Gen 48,7) identifies Ephrath with Bethlehem (1 Sam 17,12; Ruth 1,2; 4,11; Micah 5,1 [Eng. 5,2]; 1 Chr 2,24.50-52; 4,4-5). However, according to other biblical accounts, Rachel's tomb was located in the Benjamin region, either in Zelsah or Ramah (1 Sam 10,2; Jer 31,15)¹². How can one explain the different locations of Rachel's sepulcher? If there are two different traditions, can it be concluded that

¹⁰ See notes 1, 3-5, 7-8.

¹¹ NA'AMAN, "Jacob Story", 99.

¹² Regarding the complicated issues in locating Rachel's tomb, see C. RITTER, *Rachels Klage im Antiken Judentum und Frühen Christentum. Eine auslegungsgeschichtliche Studie* (AGAJU 52; Leiden 2003) 29-32; and N. NA'AMAN, "The Settlement of the Ephrathites in Bethlehem and the Location of Rachel's Tomb", *RB* 121 (2014) 516-529.

one belongs to the original record of the locality and the other is a later variation?

Na'aman maintains that Gen 35,15-21 might be a good case attesting to the Judean features to which Jacob's story alludes¹³. He, therefore, rejects the widely accepted opinion that the references to Beersheba and Bethlehem did not belong to the original Jacob story and so are to be viewed as later additions in the redactional processes. His argument is fundamental for two issues: 1) multiple identifications of the famous figure's tomb, and 2) the possibility of the Ephrathites' immigration from the highlands of Ephraim to the areas of Bethlehem¹⁴. Na'aman argues that the mentions of Beersheba and Bethlehem are nothing but evidence of the Judeans' literary efforts to eliminate memories of the northern tradition¹⁵.

However, the basis of these two claims appears to be unwarranted. First, regarding a certain person's grave, numerous biblical accounts usually indicate a single location, one burial place per person. For example, Abraham-Sarah, Isaac-Rebekah, and Jacob-Leah in Machpelah in Hebron (Mamre: Gen 23,19; 25,9-10; 35,27-29; 49,31; 50,13), Deborah in Allon-bacuth (35,8), Moses in the valley in the land of Moab, opposite Beth-peor (Deut 34,6), Judges such as Gideon in Ophrah (Judg 8,32), Tola in Shamir (10,2); Elon in Aijalon (12,12); Abdon in Pirathon (12,15); Samson in the tomb of Manoah between Zorah and Eshtaol (16,31), Samuel in Ramah (1 Sam 25,1; 28,3), and Kings of Israel and Judah in the Book of Kings. Additionally, Josh 24,30 and Judg 2,9 report that Joshua was buried somewhere on the slope of Mount Gaash, a single place, even though the locality was called both Timnath-serah or Timnath-heres. Likewise, 1 Sam 31,13 and 1 Chr 10,12 identify the tomb of Saul and his sons as somewhere — under the Esher-tree (the tamarisk-tree) — in the land of Gilead-jabesh¹⁶. The attribution of different locations to Rachel's burial place is clearly unconvincing in light of all other burial accounts in the Bible.

Second, there is no cogent evidence that David's Ephrathite origin might have been derived from the central highlands¹⁷. All the mentions of Ephrath, the individual, occur in the genealogical lists of 1 Chr 2,19.24.50; 4,4, whose reports have nothing to do with the tribe of Ephraim. Na'aman's speculative suggestion about the immigration of the Ephrathites is based

¹³ NA'AMAN, "Jacob Story", 107-108.

¹⁴ NA'AMAN, "Jacob Story", 107-108.

¹⁵ NA'AMAN, "Jacob Story", 107-108.

¹⁶ 2 Sam 21,12-14 reports a reburial process where David exhumed the bones of Saul and his son, Jonathan, from their tomb, and reburied them instead in the tomb of Saul's father, Kish.

¹⁷ Contra NA'AMAN, "Settlement of the Ephrathite and Rachel's Tomb".

on Japheth's recent attempt to equate "Ephraimite" with "Ephrathite" because of their phonetic affinity to אפרתה¹⁸. However, in other biblical passages relating to this appellative, the Ephrathites — if this can be viewed, contextually, as the inhabitants in a specific town, rather than as tribal ethnic entities — merely refer to Bethlehem in Judah¹⁹.

Therefore, given the above points, the hypothesis of two tombs for Rachel — one in the vicinity of Ramah and the other near the Judahite or Judeans in close proximity to Bethlehem — should be rejected: only one of these locations is associated with a credible source of information. Moreover, the connection between Ephrath-Bethlehem and the central highlands cannot be confirmed. The late Persian genealogies (1 Chr 2,19. 24.50; 4,4; Ps 132,6) likely tried to combine Ephrath with Kiriath-jearim on the western border of Benjamin and Bethlehem to accentuate their close relationship. Thus, it is noteworthy that the above verses, in terms of geography and based on the concept of genealogy, make it impossible to identify Ephrath with Bethlehem.

II. THE PLACEMENT OF GEN 35,16-21 WITHIN THE COMPOSITION OF GENESIS: A HISTORICAL-GEOGRAPHICAL PERSPECTIVE

Faced with the geographical connection between Ephrath and Bethlehem, most scholars in favor of a northern Ephraimite origin of the Jacob story fix the location of Rachel's sepulcher within the extent of the land of Benjamin, as 1 Sam 10,2 and Jer 31,15 report. If the matriarch's death is closely connected with Benjamin's origin, it is highly likely that her tomb was originally located inside the Benjaminite territory rather than outside it²⁰. If so, then it is important to consider the contents of Gen 35,19b that connect Ephrath, the place of the sepulcher, with Bethlehem within the land of Judah. This geographic analysis supports the investigation of the literary style of Gen 35,19b where the use of the pronoun הִיא as a deictic/indicative element in the verse points to its secondary annotation of the

¹⁸ NA'AMAN, "Settlement of the Ephrathite and Rachel's Tomb", 108; S. JAPHET, "Was David a Judahite or an Ephraimite? Light from the Genealogies", *Let us Go up to Zion. Essays in Honour of H.G.M. Williamson on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (eds. I. PROVAN – M.J. BODA) (VTSup 153; Leiden 2012) 297-306.

¹⁹ BDB 68; HALOT 81; DCH 1:362; A. DEMSKY, "The Clans of Ephrath: Their Territory and History", *TA* 13-14 (1986) 46-59.

²⁰ J.A. SOGGIN, "Die Geburt Benjamins: Genesis XXXV, 16-20 (21)", *VT* 11 (1961) 432-440, here 432; E. VOGT, "Benjamin geboren 'eine Meile' von Ephrata", *Bib* 56 (1975) 30-36; BLENKINSOPP, "Benjamin Traditions Read", 631; B.D. COX – S. ACKERMAN, "Rachel's Tomb", *JBL* 128 (2009) 135-148, here 136.

preceding toponym and evinces its later addition. Given that the nature of such a gloss stands in apposition to the preceding toponym, scholars regard the verse as an attempt to supplement indeterminate textual elements with explicative words²¹. Thus, we can securely conclude that an anonymous ancient scribe likely inserted this pronoun as a gloss to clarify the unknown locality of Ephrath²².

Given that Gen 35,19b is a later literary insertion, it is noteworthy that Jer 31,15 could not have been composed prior to the early sixth century BCE²³: Jeremiah's career spanned the late seventh century to the early sixth century BCE. Provided that this is an accurate assessment, Gen 35,19b echoes the later historical tradition (at least after the early sixth century) concerning the place related to Benjamin's birth and Rachel's tomb²⁴. Without 35,19b, Gen 35,16-19a.20-21 presents a similar picture that Benjamin was born within the Benjaminite region, just as Jer 31,15 and Ps 132,6 propose. Therefore, it is important to consider this question: What time periods do Gen 35,16-21 and the secondary addition of 35,19b reflect, respectively?

To answer this question, we must first tackle, in terms of geographical understanding, the notable disparity between the identification of Benjamin's birthplace in the non-P version (Gen 35,16-21) and that in the P version (35,23-26)²⁵. In Gen 35,23-26, the genealogy of Jacob's twelve sons intriguingly states that Benjamin was not born in Ephrath, but in Paddan Aram. In contrast, in the non-P version, the *locus classicus* for the nativity story of Jacob's sons (Gen 29,31 – 30,24), there is no mention of Benjamin's birthplace²⁶. Additionally, Gen 32,22, the preface to

²¹ G.R. DRIVER, "Glosses in the Hebrew Text of the Old Testament", *L'Ancien Testament et l'Orient* (OrBibLov 1; Louvain 1957) 123-161; VOGT, "Benjamin", 30-36; M. FISHBANE, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford 1985) 44-48.

²² SOGGIN, "Die Geburt Benjamins", 432-440, esp. 432-434; VON RAD, *Genesis*, 340; BLUM, *Komposition*, 207-208; WESTERMANN, *Genesis 12-36*, 547, 555; CARR, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 260-261; BRIEND, "Genèse 35,16-22a", 267-275, esp. 270-271; RITTER, *Rachels Klage*, 27-32; NA'AMAN, "Settlement of the Ephrathite and Rachel's Tomb", 516-529, esp. 520.

²³ Many commentators and researchers take Jer 31,15 as the beginning of the literary unit ascribed to the authentic words of the prophet Jeremiah: e.g., W.L. HOLLADAY, *Jeremiah 2. A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapters 26-52* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN 1989) 167-169; J.R. LUNDBOM, *Jeremiah 21-36. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 21B; New York 2004) 433-439; W.H. SCHMIDT, *Das Buch Jeremia. Kapitel 21-52* (ATD 21; Göttingen 2013) 134-135.

²⁴ BLENKINSOPP, "Benjamin Traditions Read", 631.

²⁵ E.g. WESTERMANN, *Genesis 12-36*, 555-556; WENHAM, *Genesis 16-50*, 328; CARR, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 93-99, esp. 95.

²⁶ J. MULENBURG, "The Birth of Benjamin", *JBL* 75 (1956) 194-201, here 195-197; VAN SETERS, *Prologue to History*, 206.

Benjamin's birth, reports Jacob's crossing of the Jabbok river with his two wives, two maid-servants and eleven sons. This implies that Benjamin was only born later (35,16-21). Benjamin had a different destiny from that of his brothers, who were born in a foreign land (Genesis 29-30), managed to weather the adversities and hardships (Genesis 31-34), and eventually returned to Jacob's homeland. Benjamin was the only one to whom his mother gave birth in the promised land among Jacob's sons. It is by the placement of 35,16-21 in the text that the author of this story perhaps emphasizes that the Benjaminite territory should be the place where its ancestor was born and came to have the title of the land.

Another issue to be considered is the geography of Jacob's journey: Gen 31,13 and 35,1 state that Jacob was destined to settle in Bethel after returning to the land, contrasting with Jacob's continuous journey from Bethel in 35,16. Thus, 35,16-21 were recorded separately and at a time later than 31,13 and 35,1-8. Why did the author of Gen 35,16-21 wish to claim that Jacob's family left the place most significant to them, where Jacob had encountered the divinity and set up a "pillar" (יָצַב יַעֲקֹב מִצֵּבָה) to mourn his beloved wife's death? This could be explained by the author choosing to stress the importance of Ephrath as a commemorative site for Rachel²⁷. Given that ancient writers rarely created or invented what they recorded *ex nihilo*, it is highly likely that, based on the well-known and well-established tradition of Jer 31,15, the author of this story recorded a local oral tradition about Rachel and Benjamin.

The other geographical point is the absence of an explicit reference to Jerusalem within the trajectory of the Jacob story even in the envelope structure of Jacob's itinerary (Genesis 28 and 35). Given Jerusalem's significant political and economic status during the biblical periods, it is intriguing that Genesis remains silent on it (cf. 2 Chr 3,1: Moriah = Jerusalem). Here, Genesis 28 and 35 refer to other crucial cities, namely Beersheba, Bethlehem, and Hebron in the territory of Judah. Further, Genesis 35 mentions Migdal-'eder without giving any clear indication of its whereabouts²⁸. A considerable majority of scholars have argued that, according to Micah 4,8, the Migdal-'eder locality is identified as the Ophel, an elevated place in the northeastern part of the city of David, linking it with the modern Temple Mount²⁹.

²⁷ COX – ACKERMAN, "Rachel's Tomb", 149-165.

²⁸ SOGGIN, "Die Geburt Benjamins", 434.

²⁹ Many commentators and scholars view Mic 4,8 as a redactional work corresponding with the post-exilic salvation prophecies, eschatological documents, or, as a self-standing unit that was added at a later point. For a widely accepted argument identifying Migdal-'eder with the Ophel, see *inter alia*: J.L. MAYS, *Micah. A Commentary* (OTL; Philadelphia,

ואתה מגדל עדר עפל בת ציון
עדיך תאתה ובאה הממשלה הראשנה ממלכת לבת ירושלם

And you, Migdal-‘eder, Ophel of the daughter of Zion;
to you shall it come, the former dominion shall come, the kingdom of the
daughter of Jerusalem (Micah 4,8).

According to Micah’s messianic oracle, the daughter of Zion is parallel to Jerusalem and thus identified as a different designation of the city. Here, the obscure word, Migdal-‘eder, is associated with the Ophel (which literally means “hill” or “acropolis”) attached to the daughter of Zion, Jerusalem. Migdal, denoting “a tower”, can be thought of as a watchtower in the modern Ophel, the ridge area between the Temple Mount and the northern part of the city of David. Rudolph, Wildberger, Wolff, McKane, Jenson, and, recently, Na’aman argue that 2 Chr 27,3; 33,14, Neh 3,25-27, and Isa 32,14 refer to a great tower (המגדל הגדול) and a watchtower (בחוץ). These might have been fortifications with a tower located between the ruins of the Davidic palace above the Stepped Stone Structure and the hill area; this tower could be the tower of Migdal-‘eder³⁰. If the location of Migdal-‘eder can be identified in this manner with the Ophel, we may ask why the author of Gen 35,16-21 avoided a direct mention of Jerusalem or the Ophel and instead employed a periphrastic expression combined with this otherwise unknown designation of Migdal-‘eder.

For the author of Gen 35,16-21, there may have been a specific reason to refer to Migdal-‘eder instead of Jerusalem in the text. Ska tries to explain why Jerusalem is rarely mentioned in the Pentateuch. He proposes that this is because, in the Second Temple period, Jerusalem had been destroyed by foreign armies and was not yet fully reconstructed. This historical event brought about misfortune, and the reconstruction of the temple allowed people to cherish eschatological hope. Thus, Ska argues that this historical ambience made the law become “the most important pillar of Israel’s life, more important than the patriarchs and the temple” and that “the postexilic community of Israel preferred to house its renewed

PA 1976) 102-103; D.R. HILLERS, *Mica. A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Micah* (Hermenia; Philadelphia, PA 1984) 56; H.W. WOLFF, *Micah. A Commentary* (Minneapolis, MN 1990) 125; W. MCKANE, *The Book of Micah. Introduction and Commentary* (Edinburgh 1998) 131-133; F.I. ANDERSEN – D.N. FREEDMAN, *Micah. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 24E; New York 2000) 428-430. In addition, a Rabbinic text, *Šeqal. 7,4*, supports this geographic understanding.

³⁰ W. RUDOLPH, *Micha-Nahum-Habakuk-Zephania* (KAT XIII/3; Gütersloh 1975) 84-85; H. WILDBERGER, *Jesaja. 3. Teilband, Jesaja 28–39* (BKAT X/3; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1982) 1270; WOLFF, *Micah*, 125; MCKANE, *Micah*, 131-133; P.P. JENSON, *Obadiah, Jonah, Micah. A Theological Commentary* (LHB/OTS 496; New York 2008) 150; N. NA’AMAN, “Five Notes on Jerusalem in the First and Second Temple Periods”, *TA* 39 (2012) 93-103, here 99-101.

identity in a city of words, the Torah, rather than in an uncompleted city of stones, Jerusalem”³¹.

If Migdal-‘eder is a different epithet for Jerusalem, this claim supports Gen 35,19b’s interpolative feature by Migdal-‘eder’s placement. From this point of view, Ephrath, the place where Rachel was buried, was on the route that Jacob took to Migdal-‘eder, the Ophel. This means that Ephrath was originally understood to be located between Bethel and Migdal-‘eder and therefore north of Jerusalem, in the land of Benjamin³². In this case, identifying Bethlehem as Ephrath must be a redactor’s reinterpretation and interpolation. This gives rise to crucial questions. In contrast to the tradition of the burial place for the first three generations of the patriarch and matriarch (Abraham-Sarah, Isaac-Rebekah, and Jacob-Leah) at Machpelah (i.e., Gen 23,19; 25,9-10; 49,31), why did the redactor depict Jacob burying Rachel in a roadside grave near Bethlehem by inserting 35,19b? What did the redactor expect to achieve by doing so³³? If this is so, why did the redactor not attach a secondary addition to clarify the identification of Migdal-‘eder as a high point in Jerusalem?

In summary, the textual analysis presented here, based first on the perspective of geography, has traced essential elements that reveal specific historical realities veiled within Gen 35,16-21 (minus 35,19b). According to Gen 35,16-19a.20-21, Benjamin’s birth apparently took place in the land of Benjamin (not in Paddan Aram, the birthplace of his eleven brothers), which has a huge impact on the presumed location of his mother’s sepulcher. The relatively unknown designation of Migdal-‘eder — without a direct reference to Jerusalem — suggests that the author may have deliberately avoiding referring to this city. It is probable that Gen 35,16-19*.20-21 reflects the historical realities of a single period that corresponds to all of these elements. Here, another point should be considered. The apparent attempt to undermine the geographical order from Bethel to Migdal-‘eder by adding the name of “Bethlehem” in 35,19b makes it highly likely that 35,19b was added to 35,16-21 in a later period. The insertion of 35,19b itself, when contrasted with Jer 31,15, could not have been done prior to the early sixth century, and thus was probably made during the post-exilic period.

³¹ J.L. SAK, “Why Does the Pentateuch Speak so Much of Torah and so Little of Jerusalem?”, *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Rise of the Torah* (eds. P. DUBOVSKÝ – D. MARKL – J.-P. SONNET) (FAT 107; Tübingen 2016) 113-128.

³² Most commentaries and articles that deal with the location of the “original Ephrath” agree with this statement. See notes 22-27.

³³ RITTER, *Rachels Klage*, 52-53.

However, this textual analysis cannot specifically indicate when Gen 35,16-19a.20-21 and Gen 35,19b were composed, other than to place them somewhere between the late monarchic period and the early Hellenistic period. Redactional analysis is confronted with fundamental limits when passages lack clear markers regarding their date of composition. By examining archaeological data, instrumental observations may help refine the dating of the two narrative levels.

III. A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF SETTLEMENT HISTORY OF THE MENTIONED SITES: AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL VIEW

In this section, I present relevant archaeological data, specifically relating to the occupation profile of each site. I look for specific periods between the rise and fall of given sites to aid in identifying the likely historical background of Gen 35,16-21. It is central to this study to examine the history of settlement and the occupation profiles based on archaeological data and to apply them to elucidate the historical realities of a specific time period. It is likely that an author of specific biblical texts who had a coeval relationship with specific regions might accentuate certain details about them. For instance, if their material culture flourished, their political and economic status would be evaluated highly and portrayed as exerting an influence over other sites. On the other hand, if specific areas and cities had already declined and their authority lessened, there would be no reason for the author to pay special attention to them, unless the author intended to reminisce about their past. This study is based on the basic premise that this relationship between the author and their contemporaneous ambiance can also be applied to the literary analysis of the story.

Gen 35,16-21 refers to Bethel, Ephrath, Migdal-'eder, and Bethlehem. Of these four sites, the biblical site of Ephrath in the land of Benjamin cannot be securely identified. Gen 35,19 states that Rachel was buried "on the way to Ephrath, Bethlehem" (בדרך אפרתה), or in other words, somewhere in the vicinity of Bethlehem, near Ramat-Rachel. The redactor's intention to attach "that is Bethlehem" to Ephrath implies that the location of the matriarch's sepulcher is not far from Bethlehem. This study, therefore, examines the archaeology of the land of Benjamin and the surrounding areas of Ramat-Rachel and Bethlehem as an alternative. To ensure thoroughness, I provide a brief overview of the occupation profiles of Bethel and Migdal-'eder (the Ophel in Jerusalem).

1. *Bethel (Beitin)*

Bethel is one of the most important sites for biblical historians and archaeologists³⁴. However, the excavation reports for Bethel have been severely criticized because of a lack of stratum indications, a deficiency of comprehensive section drawings and relevant descriptions, and an incongruity between drawings and the precise locations of findings and features³⁵. Nevertheless, the fact that sufficient pottery sherds and building structures have been investigated enables scholars to construct a general history of Iron Age II and the Neo-Babylonian period. Kelso's fourth phase of Iron Age I is understood as the early phase of Iron Age IIA in Bethel, whose diagnostic remains appear to be scarce. Finkelstein and Singer-Avitz, therefore, judge that the Bethel population in the late tenth-ninth century BCE was actually quite small³⁶. A mixture of the pottery sherds of the Israelite and Judahite traditions, a *mlk* stamp impression, and the lack of a destruction layer between Iron Age IIB and IIC strata attest to the prosperity of the material culture in Bethel in the eighth-seventh century BCE³⁷. Likewise, due to the absence of the destruction layer after Iron Age IIC and a wedge-shaped, reed-impressed sherd and a Babylonian seal, it is concluded that the settlement seems to have been continually occupied until the late sixth century BCE³⁸.

No explicit architecture or typical pottery repertoire can be reliably dated to the Persian period except possibly for a wall in Area I and one piece of a Greek *lekythos* from the fifth century BCE³⁹. This small finding might provide a clue about trade in Bethel and the existence of a settlement, despite the small size of the town, at that time⁴⁰.

³⁴ K. KOENEN, *Bethel. Geschichte, Kult und Theologie* (OBO 92; Freiburg – Göttingen 2003) 27-68; J.F. GOMES, *The Sanctuary of Bethel and the Configuration of Israelite Identity* (BZAW 368; Berlin – New York 2006) 2-4.

³⁵ W.G. DEVER, "Beitin", *ABD* (1992) 1:651-652; J.L. KELSO, "Bethel", *NEAEHL* (1993) 1:192-194.

³⁶ I. FINKELSTEIN – L. SINGER-AVITZ, "Reevaluating Bethel", *ZDPV* 125 (2009) 33-48.

³⁷ H. ESHEL, "A *mlk* Stamp from Beth-El", *IEJ* 39 (1989) 60-62.

³⁸ L.A. SINCLAIR, "Bethel Pottery of the Sixth Century B.C.", *The Excavation of Bethel (1934-1960)* (ed. J.L. KELSO) (AASOR 39; Cambridge 1968) 70-76; O. LIPSCHITS, *The Fall and Rise of Jerusalem. Judah under Babylonian Rule* (Winona Lake, IN 2005) 204-205, 242-243; O. LIPSCHITS, "Bethel Revisited", *Rethinking Israel. Studies in the History and Archaeology of Ancient Israel in Honor of Israel Finkelstein* (eds. O. LIPSCHITS – Y. GADOT – M.J. ADAMS) (Winona Lake, IN 2017) 233-246. For the critical thought rejecting the sixth-century material culture of Bethel, see W.G. DEVER, "Archaeological Methods and Results: A Review of Two Recent Publication", *Or* 40 (1971) 459-471, here 468-469; FINKELSTEIN – AVITZ, "Reevaluating Bethel", 42.

³⁹ J.L. KELSO, *The Excavation of Bethel (1934-1960)* (AASOR 39; Cambridge 1968) 80, pl. 37:10.

⁴⁰ LIPSCHITS, "Bethel Revisited", 233-246, here 237-242.

2. General Picture of the Land of Benjamin ⁴¹

The important Benjaminite sites were sparsely settled and the population density was evidently low during the ninth century BCE, in great contrast to their tenth-century BCE material culture ⁴². However, the Benjamin area experienced great economic and political prosperity once again from the seventh century BCE to the early sixth century BCE. During the first half of the seventh century BCE, after Sennacherib's campaign (701 BCE), the land of Benjamin served as a critical agricultural area in the hinterland of Jerusalem, which was necessary to supply the daily needs of the royal families ⁴³. However, during the Josianic period, when the Shephelah regained its economic status for the Kingdom of Judah, Benjamin's political and economic position became relatively weakened as a result ⁴⁴. In contrast, the land of Benjamin emerged as a major focus in the political and economic sphere during the Neo-Babylonian period. Benjamin's material culture survived from the Babylonian campaigns that apparently destroyed other areas of the Kingdom, and Mizpah was used as a new provincial center by the Babylonians ⁴⁵. However, following the early Persian period, Benjamin's material culture gradually declined and appeared to be in the last stages of decay around the mid-to-late fifth century BCE ⁴⁶. No revival of material civilization in Benjamin territory occurred again until the late Hellenistic or Hasmonean period.

⁴¹ See the summarized archaeological data-excavation reports and articles about the major excavated sites, salvage excavation reports from the rural sites, and surface surveys of the Benjaminite sites as a foundation for historical reconstruction in Y. LEE-SAK, *Reassessment of the Benjaminite Traditions in the Hebrew Bible in Light of Archaeological Data and Historical Reconstruction* (Ph.D Dissertation Tel Aviv University; Tel Aviv 2021) Chapter 2.

⁴² Y. LEE-SAK, "Polemical Propaganda of the Golah Community against the Gibeonites: Historical Background of Joshua 9 and 2 Samuel 21 in the Early Persian Period", *JSOT* (2019) 115-132, here 117-118.

⁴³ O. LIPSCHITS – O. SERGI – I. KOCH, "Royal Judahite Storage Jars: Reconsidering the Chronology of the *lmk* Stamp Impressions", *TA* 37 (2010) 3-32; O. LIPSCHITS – O. SERGI – I. KOCH, "Judahite Stamped and Incised Jar Handles: A Tool for Studying the History of Late Monarchic Judah", *TA* 38 (2011) 5-41.

⁴⁴ LIPSCHITS – SERGI – KOCH, "Royal Judahite Storage Jars"; LIPSCHITS – SERGI – KOCH, "Judahite Stamped and Incised Jar Handle".

⁴⁵ LIPSCHITS, *Fall and Rise*, 210-271; *contra* A. FAUST, *Judah in the Neo-Babylonian Period*. The Archaeology of Desolation (SBLABS 18; Atlanta, GA 2012) 181-231.

⁴⁶ O. LIPSCHITS, "Shedding New Light on the Dark Years of the 'Exilic Period': New Studies, Further Elucidation, and Some Questions Regarding the Archaeology of Judah as an 'Empty Land'", *Interpreting Exile*. Interdisciplinary Studies of Displacement and Deportation in Biblical and Modern Contexts (eds. B.E. KELLE – F.R. AMES – J.L. WRIGHT) (SBLAILL 10; Atlanta, GA 2011) 57-90; O. LIPSCHITS, "The Rural Economy of Judah during the Persian Period and the Settlement History of the District System", *The Economy of Ancient Judah in Its Historical Context* (eds. M.L. MILLER – E. BEN-ZVI – G.N. KNOP-PERS) (Winona Lake, IN 2015) 237-264, here 245-247, 258.

3. *Jerusalem (and the Ophel area)*

It is important to note that during the monarchic period, Jerusalem was magnified as a theocratic center that controlled both politics and the economy and served as the capital city of the Kingdom of Judah. Following the destruction of the temple by the Babylonians, Jerusalem lay desolate throughout the entire sixth century BCE ⁴⁷. As a result, the pivotal role Jerusalem had played in the political and religious spheres of ancient Israel during the monarchic period was greatly diminished. Although the temple was reconstructed after the early Persian era, an archaeological picture of that time suggests that “Jerusalem was only a small city, nothing more than a temple”, and the political status of Jerusalem was not restored ⁴⁸. The territory around Jerusalem consisted mainly of rural sites, apart from the northern areas of the city of David — the inhabited area on a narrow stretch of the upper part of the hill and the Ophel — where the elite priestly groups and some people settled for ritual services during the Persian period ⁴⁹. This pattern of a sparse population in Jerusalem continued to exist throughout the Persian and early Hellenistic periods ⁵⁰.

4. *The Areas Surrounding Bethlehem (Ramat-Rachel and Bethlehem)*

In contrast to Jerusalem, Ramat-Rachel flourished continuously, not only as the capital of the district of Bet-Hacherem (Ramat-Rachel) but also as the most developed administrative center in the Judean highlands south of Jerusalem. This continued, with no signs of a hiatus, from the Iron Age IIC through the Neo-Babylonian and Persian eras, and even

⁴⁷ FAUST, *Judah in the Neo-Babylonian Period*, 167-181.

⁴⁸ O. LIPSCHITS, “Persian Period Judah: A New Perspective”, *Texts, Contexts and Readings in Postexilic Literature*. Explorations into Historiography and Identity Negotiation in Hebrew Bible and Related Texts (ed. L. JONKER) (FAT 2/53; Tübingen 2011) 187-212, here 189-190; O. LIPSCHITS, “Between Archaeology and Text: A Reevaluation of the Development Process of Jerusalem in the Persian Period”, *Congress Volume Helsinki 2010* (ed. M. NISSINEN) (VTSup 148; Leiden 2012) 145-165.

⁴⁹ A number of Persian period stamp impressions and pottery sherds were found in the center of the southeastern ridge in the northeastern area of the city of David, and just below the Ophel. Lipschits argues that the Persian period finds seem to have originated from the Ophel as well. O. LIPSCHITS, “Persian Period Finds from Jerusalem: Facts and Interpretation”, *JHS* 9 (2009) Art. no. 20, 9-12; LIPSCHITS, “Persian Period Judah”, 189-190.

⁵⁰ I. FINKELSTEIN, “Persian Period Jerusalem and Yehud: A Rejoinder”, *JHS* 9 (2009) Art. no. 24; H. GEVA, “Jerusalem’s Population in Antiquity: A Minimalist View”, *TA* 41 (2014) 131-160.

extending into the Hellenistic period ⁵¹. This fact is supported by the presence of a large number of stamped handles found at the site, spanning from the seventh century to the second century BCE ⁵². It is certain that, in light of the many *yhwd* stamp impressions (over 300 sherds) unearched, no other site in the Judean highlands, including Jerusalem, could challenge the political status of Ramat-Rachel in the Persian period. The political pivot during the Persian period was not Jerusalem, where a small number of people exercised religious hegemony, but rather the district of Bet-Hacherem to which Bethlehem belonged ⁵³. Perhaps the high position that Jerusalem enjoyed during the Monarchic period was inherited by Ramat-Rachel, the new administrative center of the Persian period, which gave it a political status that remained until the late Hellenistic period.

Excavators at Bethlehem insist that, due to the discovery of a *bullā* and a *lmlk* jar handle, there is evidence that Bethlehem played an administrative role in conjunction with Ramat-Rachel in the district south of Jerusalem during the eighth-seventh centuries ⁵⁴. However, the excavators have failed to unearth a significant amount of pottery sherds that could be ascribed to the Babylonian, Persian, or Hellenistic periods ⁵⁵. They therefore argue that settlement in the Babylonian periods was probably restricted to Geruth Chimham (Jer 41,17), near modern Bethlehem, which was later only sparsely inhabited during the Persian and Hellenistic periods ⁵⁶.

⁵¹ O. LIPSCHITS, "Ramat Raḥel", *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Bible and Archaeology* (ed. D.M. MASTER) (Oxford 2013) II:213-221; O. LIPSCHITS – Y. GADOT – M. OEMING, *Ramat Raḥel IV — The Renewed Excavations by the Tel Aviv-Heidelberg Expedition (2005-2010)*. Stratigraphy and Architecture (SMNIAMS 39; Tel Aviv 2020); O. LIPSCHITS et al., *Ramat Raḥel VI — The Renewed Excavations by the Tel Aviv-Heidelberg Expedition (2005-2010)*. The Babylonian-Persian Pits (SMNIAMS 40; Tel Aviv 2021).

⁵² LIPSCHITS, "Rural Economy of Judah", 239-240; O. LIPSCHITS, *Age of Empires. The History and Administration of Judah in the 8th-2nd Centuries BCE in Light of the Storage-Jar Stamp Impressions* (Mosaics 2; Philadelphia, PA – Tel Aviv 2021) 1-6. Stamp impressions include the following: over 300 *lmlk* (late eighth to early seventh centuries), 40 concentric-circle (mid-seventh century), 57 rosette stamped handles (late seventh century), 73 lion (sixth century), and 372 *yhwd* (fifth to early-second centuries) as well as 33 *yršlm* (second century).

⁵³ Y. GADOT, "In the Valley of the King: Jerusalem's Rural Hinterland in the 8th-4th centuries BCE", *TA* 42 (2015) 3-26, here 19-21.

⁵⁴ K. PRAG, "Bethlehem: A Site Assessment", *PEQ* 132 (2000) 169-181; L. NIGRO, "Bethlehem in the Bronze and Iron Ages in the Light of Recent Discoveries by the Palestinian Mota-Dach", *Vicino Oriente* 19 (2015) 1-24, here 9.

⁵⁵ L. NIGRO et al., "New Archaeological Features in Bethlehem (Palestine): The Italian-Palestinian Rescue Season of November 2016", *Vicino Oriente* 21 (2017) 5-57.

⁵⁶ K. PRAG, "Bethlehem", *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Bible and Archaeology* (ed. D.M. MASTER) (Oxford 2013) I:104-110; L. NIGRO, "Bethlehem in the Bronze and Iron Ages", 8-9.

Table: The Summary of the Occupation Profile of the Mentioned Sites ⁵⁷.

	Bethel	Land of Benjamin	Jerusalem/ Ophel	Ramat- Rachel	Bethlehem
Iron IIB	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Iron IIC	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Babylonian Period	✓	✓	—	✓	Declined
Persian Period	Disputable but evidently declined	Declined and shrunk to the central area of Benjamin	Only the Ophel area revived but remained small	✓	—

IV. SYNTHESIS BETWEEN TEXTUAL ANALYSIS AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATION: A HISTORICAL RECONSTRUCTION

From the preceding textual and archaeological investigations, this paper endeavors to disclose the following crucial elements embedded within the story of Gen 35,16-21.

First, Gen 35,16-19*.20-21, without v. 19b, likely preserves the original tradition of Jacob's youngest son's nativity and Rachel's tomb. We must also take into account the composition date of Jer 31,15, whose contents also describe the original placement of the sepulcher in the Benjamin region and whose composition emerged later than the early mid-sixth century. Therefore it is evident that Gen 35,19b is a secondary insertion whose date was later than Jer 31,15. This leaves a single unresolved question: When was Gen 35,16-19*.20-21 first composed? Further consideration of the two issues presented below provides a likely composition date for the text.

Second, highlighting both the youngest patriarch's birth (standing in contrast to his eleven brothers' births in Paddan-Aram) and the location of the matriarch's sepulcher within the central area of Benjamin, not in Bethel, likely reflects the deliberate intentions of the author of Gen 35,16-19a.20-21. Why did the author narrate that Benjamin was not born in Bethel, the border city between Benjamin and Ephraim, but somewhere

⁵⁷ "✓" denotes that a certain site was inhabited during a specific period, whereas "—" means that it was unoccupied or abandoned.

south of Bethel, Ramah, or Selsah, near Tell en-Nasbeh (Mizpah)? The author clearly intended to demonstrate the significance of the Benjamin region by underlining Benjamin and Rachel's involvement in this area rather than in one of the most important cultic sites, Bethel. Further, when did the land of Benjamin explode onto the historical stage of ancient Israel and emerge as an important entity that retained its authority? That development is the most likely explanation of why the author sought to connect the origin of Jacob's youngest son with that region.

Third, employing a designation of the relatively unknown Migdal-'eder with no reference to the well-known epithet of Jerusalem in Gen 35,16-19*.20-21 is striking, especially since Micah 4,8 testifies to a clear geographical proximity between these two localities. Given the highly prominent position of Jerusalem in biblical periods, it is perplexing that the author used the little-known appellation of Migdal-'eder instead of Jerusalem. Avoiding direct reference to Jerusalem seems to be a deliberate literary device through which the author of Gen 35,16-19*.20-21 signals the diminished status of this once-important city⁵⁸. When did Jerusalem lose so much prominence that the author felt the need to use a different name to identify the site?

Synthesizing the latter of the above two points leads us to the following conclusion: Gen 35,16-21 (with the exception of 19b) likely reflects a specific period of time when the land of Benjamin held a primary position among other areas of Ancient Israel and a time when Jerusalem had simultaneously met its demise. Following the above investigation of archaeological data, the land of Benjamin played a major role in the history of ancient Israel during the first half of the seventh and sixth centuries, when the other Judean highlands and the Shephelah had been destroyed by the Assyrian and Babylonian forces and were abandoned following these respective campaigns. Jerusalem and some areas of its core periphery survived Sennacherib's campaign, but were later destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar II and not restored to their former glory until the Hasmonean period. Only a single period appears to satisfy the drastic contrast between the land of Benjamin and the city of Jerusalem in terms of their political and economic positions: the sixth century BCE, specifically following the destruction of the temple.

⁵⁸ One could ask whether the intentional avoidance of the name "Jerusalem" could be considered a literary device even though Jerusalem may have continued to hold an important place in the minds of the author and the intended audience. However, this question presumes the lingering importance of Jerusalem in the mind of the redactor without adequately considering why Migdal-'eder was preferred to Jerusalem.

Here, I suggest that the sixth-century author, a Benjaminite, intended to present the history of their origin (or provenance) to emphasize the political and economic status of land of Benjamin, thus creating Gen 35,16-21. Considering the non-P monarchic period texts in Gen 28,10 – 35,8, the author could not have ignored the tradition that Benjamin's eleven brothers were born in Paddan-Aram and that there was no clear identification of Benjamin's birthplace. This might have caused the sixth-century Benjaminite author to locate the story of their ancestor's birth in the promised land, valuing the uniqueness of this area in comparison with Paddan-Aram. It seems that the author initially framed the extent of the land of Benjamin using the path Jacob's family travelled from Bethel, its northern border to Migdal-'eder, and then beyond the Ophel, its southern border, as mentioned in Josh 18,13.16. The author then decided to place Benjamin's birthplace and Rachel's tomb in the middle, near Tel en-Nasbeh (Mizpah). If this theory is correct, the author knew that the other regions affiliated with Jacob's eleven sons suffered dire fates at the hands of the Assyrians and the Babylonians, while the author's flourishing homeland was the only surviving region worthy of Benjamin's birth.

If the basic story of Gen 35,16-21 reflects the sixth century BCE, then when would Gen 35,19b have been interpolated into it? To propose its compositional phase, one must consider several points relating to 35,19b. Why did the redactor identify Bethlehem as the location of Rachel's tomb and insert that note into the text? Why did the redactor, who would fully understand the symbolic significance of Jerusalem and recognize its absence in 35,16-21, insert its appellation? What did Jacob's departure from Bethel toward Bethlehem and Benjamin's birth in the vicinity of Bethlehem mean to the redactor?

Here, I argue that archaeological finds within the land of Benjamin in the Persian period provide a reasonable correspondence to the historical background of Gen 35,19b. The pivotal sites in the Benjamin region (i.e., Bethel and Mizpah) appear to have been in the last stages of decay or to have met their gradual demise around the second half of the fifth century BCE. Demographic studies and some biblical accounts propose that significant numbers of the Benjaminites and the Gibeonites left their homeland and resettled in the south or in the surrounding areas of Jerusalem⁵⁹. In other

⁵⁹ O. LIPSCHITS, "The Origins of the Jewish Population of Modi'in and its Vicinity", *Cathedra* 85 (1997) 7-32 (Hebrew); LIPSCHITS, *Fall and Rise*, 245-249; Neh 2,33; 6,2; 7,37; 11,34-35; 1 Chr 8,12.28.32. It is very intriguing that here Bethlehem is embedded in two lists of the repatriates who returned to Zion, particularly, in the part of the Benjaminite clans (Ezra 2,20-35; Neh 7,25-38). In my opinion, these lists report the historical fact that part of the Benjaminites gradually resettled in Bethlehem during the early to mid Persian period.

words, the Benjaminites seemed to assimilate into Yehud in the Persian era. This Benjaminite migration matches well with the journey of Jacob's family from the central areas of the land of Benjamin to "somewhere close to Bethlehem", which the redactor intended to underscore by inserting 35,19b.

The political and economic setting of the Persian province of Yehud, reconstructed from archaeological data from Jerusalem and Ramat-Rachel, mirrors the redactor's contemporaneous situation in the mid-Persian period. The size of Persian Jerusalem, which primarily occupied the northern part of the city of David (25-30 dunams), demonstrates that even after the reconstruction of the temple in 515 BCE, Jerusalem remained a small cultic center in which the priestly elites resided for their ritual services. During the Persian and even the early mid-Hellenistic periods, the provincial center of Ramat-Rachel inherited the political and economic status that Jerusalem had enjoyed in the monarchic period. This seems to explain why for this non-P redactor it was unnatural to draw special attention to the priestly city of Jerusalem.

Meanwhile, the redactor in Yehud, by adding the designation of Bethlehem after the phrase, "on the way to Ephrath" (בדרך אפרתה), was likely to be concerned with the district of Ramat-Rachel, located close to Bethlehem, since they knew Bethlehem was sparsely settled. Inserting 35,19b may be indicative of this redactor's strong wish that the origin of the Benjaminites should be directly intertwined with "the way to Bethlehem", where David — the authentic ancestor of the Golah community and the emblem of the Persian province of Yehud — was born, rather than with their indigenous territory, the Benjamin region. As a result, the redactor built upon a form of preserved memories pertaining to Bethlehem, the scarcely settled village, previously notable as David's hometown, and created strong ties between Benjamin, the matriarch Rachel, and the surrounding areas of Bethlehem symbolizing Golah's origin. While Jerusalem was omitted from Jacob's itinerary, "somewhere close to Ephrath" was an important link underlined by inserting "that is Bethlehem" in the process of redaction during the mid-Persian period.

V. JUDEAN REWORKING OF THE STORY OF BENJAMIN'S BIRTH AND RACHEL'S TOMB (GEN 35,19B)

In this paper, I establish the likely historical context for the two versions of Benjamin's birth, Rachel's death, and her tomb: the sixth-century for the story told in 35,16-19a.20-21 and the mid-Persian period for the

insertion of 35,19b. A number of critics in the diachronic field have frequently viewed the inserted section (35,19b) as a redactional bridge through which Judean scribes attempted to connect these two originally independent traditions. I go one step beyond this redactional bridge and endeavor to answer why the Judean scribes wanted to combine the two traditions. This question can be formulated in a different way: Why did these Judean scribes decide to recall and reinterpret the past events of the youngest patriarch's birth and the matriarch's death in this particular way?

The demise of the Benjaminites' material culture and Benjaminites' assimilation into the province of Yehud in the mid-Persian period provided a unique opportunity for the post-exilic Judeans to reconsider their identities and set up a counter-memory to subvert the specifics of Benjamin's solidarity with the areas north of Jerusalem. If the Judean reworking of this narrative is read from this specific perspective, naming the place where Benjamin was born and his mother died as Bethlehem takes on added importance: Gen 35,19b is clearly more than a single interpolation. By inserting 35,19b, the redactor may have expected that the entire story of Gen 35,16-21 would be re-read with the Judean background. This is the literary implication of the later Judean writer's effort to take ownership of the Benjaminites' tradition; thus, it is necessary to place the function of this interpolation in Gen 35,19b within the broader post-exilic redaction.

The redactor's subtle but firm and decisive assertion that Benjamin's origin was inextricably interwoven with the hometown of David must be seriously considered. David who was born in Bethlehem became the emblem of Judah, and the redactor asserted that Benjamin was a Bethlehemite, connecting him to Judah rather than with his family's indigenous territory. Shifting Benjamin's birthplace to Bethlehem perhaps served to show how completely the Benjaminites assimilated themselves into the Judean community in Yehud, David's authentic heir. From this perspective, Benjamin's identity would be redefined by adding 35,19b to Gen 35,16-21. The Judeans, in this case, would enjoy taking over the prestige of Benjamin's origin as the only son of Jacob who was born in this region and not in Aram. Without ignoring or erasing Rachel and Benjamin's kinship with Joseph, a symbol of the northern Israelites, the Judeans attempted to redefine Benjamin's identity by shifting his birthplace and Rachel's tomb to the vicinity of Bethlehem. This attempt might reflect the strength of the Judeans' intention to assert control over the Benjaminites and to propagandize the close ties between the Benjaminites and Judeans in Yehud.

The present essay reviews the significance of the reworking of the tradition of Benjamin's birth conducted by the Persian Judeans, focusing on the association of Benjamin and Rachel with Judah rather than with Joseph. The insertion of 35,19b must be regarded as Judean polemic, arguing for the Benjaminites' close relationship with the Judeans in view of the wider corpus of Gen 35,16-21 and Jacob's other travelogues. Accordingly, this seemingly minor addition is significant. The account of Benjamin's birth was detached from its original geographic location and its own tribal setting and is now situated within the horizon of the Patriarchal stories. This makes it possible to focus on *Sitz in der Literatur* rather than on *Sitz im Leben*, where the former accounts for its meaning in combination with its adjacent contexts⁶⁰. Through this addition, the text no longer serves to connect Benjamin's origin with the northern areas of Jerusalem but rather forges a bond between Benjamin and the Persian Judeans. Taking ownership of this tradition of Benjamin's birth was a significant program by which Judeans re-conceptualized their role as the new Judah in Yehud.

The Institute of Christianity and Korean Culture
The College of Theology
Yonsei University
South Korea

Yitzhak LEE-SAK

SUMMARY

Observing historical (or historiographical) and geographical features, this paper demonstrates that Gen 35,16-21 is composed of an original story in vv. 16-19a.20-21 and a later insertion in v. 19b. Synthesizing textual analysis and archaeological observations of the occupation profiles of the pertinent sites leads to the conclusion that the sixth-century story in Gen 35,16-19a.20-21 locates Benjamin's nativity and Rachel's sepulcher within the Benjamin area and refers to Migdar-eder rather than to Jerusalem because the land of Benjamin had flourished while Jerusalem was greatly diminished. The article also argues that verse 19b echoes the mid-Persian period setting when Jerusalem was only a small cultic center, whereas Ramat-Rachel continued to thrive instead of Mizpah, and the Benjaminites resettled in Yehud.

⁶⁰ I am strongly influenced by Hong's discussion of this concept of *Sitz in der Literatur* and his idea of the later redactor's attempt to reinterpret the original story by adding an insertion. See K.P. HONG, "The Deceptive Pen of Scribes: Judean Reworking of the Bethel Tradition as a Program for Assuming Israelite Identity", *Bib* 92 (2011) 427-441, here 436-440.

STONES THAT STRIKE DOWN GIANTS: DANIEL AND DAVID IN A NEW LIGHT

David and Goliath's battle scene is one of the most iconic stories in the Bible ¹. It is in fact one of the best examples of a theme relayed in other ancient books (Exodus, Joshua, Judges, sections of Samuel and Kings) and in later narratives (Judith, Esther, Maccabees and Daniel): namely, the victory of a weak figure, who trusts in the Lord and functions as an "archetypal future savior of Israel" ², over a mighty oppressor, who trusts only in his power and who represents the pagan nations. Of those abovementioned examples, the book of Daniel comes closest to the story of David and Goliath. Consequently, in this paper, particular attention is paid to resemblances between the David and Goliath scene (1 Samuel 17) and Nebuchadnezzar's dream of the statue (Daniel 2).

The comparison between the two scenes has received little attention from scholars. G.W. Buchanan (1999), M. Segal (2009), A. Rofé (2015) and B.A. Verret (2020) deal with this issue in a secondary way only. Buchanan does not identify the David and Goliath narrative as a possible intertext for Daniel 2; he simply points to the parallelism in the opposition of the contenders (Daniel-Nebuchadnezzar and David-Goliath). He also refers to the narrative of chapter 6 as "another David-Goliath theme, one of the many instances in the Book of Daniel where a great reversal took place" ³. Segal highlights a similar contradiction in Nebuchadnezzar and Saul's seeming lack of knowledge about the identity of Daniel and David respectively (cf. Dan 1,19; 2,25; 1 Sam 16,21 and 17,55-58) ⁴. Rofé merely poses the following question with no intention of answering it: "Is there not a resemblance between the stone which felled the Philistine and the stone in Daniel 2, which, cut without hands, smashed a huge and awesome image?" ⁵. Verret more clearly links Goliath's defeat with the image from Daniel 2,

¹ I would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their valuable observations.

² A. ROFÉ, "David Overcomes Goliath (1 Samuel 17): Genre, Text, Origin and Message of the Story", *Henoch* 37 (2015) 65-100, here 92.

³ G.W. BUCHANAN, *The Book of Daniel* (Mellen Biblical Commentary Old Testament Series 25; Lewiston, NY 1999) 28, 34-36, 159 (references taken from later reprinting: Eugene, OR 2005).

⁴ M. SEGAL, "From Joseph to Daniel: The Literary Development of the Narrative in Daniel 2", *VT* 59 (2009) 123-149, here 126.

⁵ ROFÉ, "David Overcomes Goliath", 92.

particularly in relation to the stone and the part of the body it strikes, namely, Goliath's lower leg ⁶.

The only study that directly addresses this relationship is a short paper by N. Golan (2019) ⁷, which probes the close links between the two passages, draws an analogy, and points out their essential elements. In continuity with Rofé, who places its origin around the fourth century B.C.E., Golan concludes that Goliath's story predates Daniel, and that it therefore influenced the book of Daniel in some way ⁸.

My goal is to identify further elements that demonstrate the close relationship between the passages ⁹ and also show how the David and Goliath story influenced the book of Daniel as a whole. I begin with an analysis of the two scenes, situating them in their context and outlining some of the most usual interpretations. In a second phase, I identify the commonalities between the two stories. Finally, I seek to show ways the scene of the battle between David and Goliath may have influenced the rest of the book of Daniel.

I. DANIEL AND THE DREAM OF THE STATUE (DAN 2,1-49)

1) *The Story of Daniel 2*

Unlike Daniel 1, which was added later because of its function as an introduction either to the entire book or, as seems more probable, to the section containing the stories (Daniel 2–6) ¹⁰, the kernel of chapter 2 is possibly one of the oldest parts of the book. This section of Daniel probably originated among Mesopotamian rather than Palestinian Jews ¹¹, and for this reason there might have been a shorter, original version of the story in circulation. Some hypotheses place the origin of the story of

⁶ B.A. VERRET, *The Serpent in Samuel*. A Messianic Motif (Eugene, OR 2020) 54–55.

⁷ N. GOLAN, "Metal and Stone: An Analogy between the Story of David and Goliath (1 Sam 17) and the Story of Nebuchadnezzar's Dream (Dan 2)", *ZAW* 131 (2019) 631–635.

⁸ ROFÉ, "David Overcomes Goliath", 92.

⁹ I also suggested this parallelism. See F. MILÁN, "¿Un Daniel polifónico? El libro de Daniel y la tradición del Antiguo Testamento", *ScrTh* 45 (2013) 335–362, here 354.

¹⁰ J.J. COLLINS, *Daniel*. A Commentary on the Book of Daniel (WBC 30; Minneapolis, MN 1993) 35, 129–130; P.R. DAVIES, *Daniel* (OTG 4; Sheffield 1985) 43; W.L. HUMPHREYS, "A Life-Style for Diaspora: A Study of the Tales of Esther and Daniel", *JBL* 92 (1973) 211–223, here 219.

¹¹ L.F. HARTMAN – A.A. DI LELLA, *The Book of Daniel*. A New Translation with Notes and Commentary (AB 23; Garden City, NY 1978) 152. Collins sees the origin of these traditions in the eastern Diaspora: J.J. COLLINS, *Daniel*. With an Introduction to Apocalyptic Literature (FOTL 20; Grand Rapids, MI 1984) 35.

Daniel 2 in the last moments of the exilic period (the time of Nabonidus) or shortly after the exile (the end of the sixth or the beginning of the fifth century B.C.E.)¹². According to the developmental theory of the book — the theory most accepted among scholars¹³ — the story would have grown at different times until it was joined first to the cycle of stories (around the fourth and third centuries B.C.E.), and later to the rest of the book (the Maccabean period, when the book of Daniel, or at least some stories of the book, might have become well known; see 1 Macc 2,59-60). In this process, some ideas in the visions (cc. 7–12) were developed from court-tales¹⁴. When the משכילים (Dan 11,33-35) — the group probably hidden behind the author(s) of Daniel¹⁵ — added the visions of chapters 8–12, they would insert some additions in chapters 2 and 7, conferring the current apocalyptic tone on them¹⁶. At this final stage, all the stories, but particularly chapters 2 and 7, might have been read with the Maccabean revolt in mind.

Leaving aside the intricate history of the composition of Daniel 2, it is worth remembering the importance of this chapter for an understanding of the entire book¹⁷, and this mainly for two reasons: it denotes the chronology in terms of the succession of kingdoms, and it has a bearing on chapter 7, the place where stories and visions intersect. In this way, and besides agreeing in terms of general content — dreams about the meaning of the story — and in their use of Aramaic, the two chapters frame the concentric structure of the first part of the book¹⁸.

¹² G.G. LABONTÉ, “Gèneses 41 et Daniel 2: Question d’origine”, *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings* (ed. A.S. VAN DER WOUDE) (BETL 106; Leuven 1993) 282.

¹³ COLLINS, *Daniel* (1993), 24-29.

¹⁴ J.J. COLLINS, “The Court-Tales in Daniel and the Development of Apocalyptic”, *JBL* 94 (1975) 218-234, here 234.

¹⁵ COLLINS, *Daniel* (1993), 66-67.

¹⁶ G. ARANDA, *Daniel* (CNBJ 22; Bilbao 2006) 20-23. On this controversial issue, see J.-M. HUSSER, “La fin et l’origine. Conséquence inattendue de l’eschatologie en Dn 2”, *Ce Dieu qui vient. Études sur l’Ancien et le Nouveau Testament offertes au Professeur Bernard Renaud à l’occasion de son soixante-cinquième anniversaire* (ed. R. KUNTZMANN) (Paris 1995) 253. According to Kratz, the additions in chapter 2 and supplements in chapters 7–12 have in common that “all are oriented to the end-time during the reign of King Antiochus IV Epiphanes”: R.G. KRATZ, “The Visions in Daniel”, in *The Book of Daniel. Composition and Reception* (eds. J.J. COLLINS – P.W. FLINT) (VTSup 83; Leiden 2001) I:93.

¹⁷ G.A. KLINGBEIL, “‘Rocking the Mountain’: Text, Theology, and Mission in Daniel 2”, in *“For You Have Strengthened Me”*. Biblical and Theological Studies in Honor of Gerhard Pfandl in Celebration of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday (eds. M. PRÖBSTLE – G.A. KLINGBEIL – M.G. KLINGBEIL) (St Peter am Hart 2007) 117-139, here 125.

¹⁸ On the chiasmus-like structure and the strong links between chaps. 2–7, 3–6 and 4–5, see the classic study by A. LENGLET, “La structure littéraire de Daniel 2–7”, *Bib* 53 (1972) 169-190.

Regarding literary genre, traditionally the stories of the first part have been understood, in a broad sense, as exemplifications, although a variety of subgenres have been proposed (romance, novel, midrash, *Märchen*, legend, instructional narrative, etc.)¹⁹. Daniel 2 can be considered a tale of the courtier who succeeds²⁰, and more specifically as a “court tale of conflict”²¹ or as an “interpretation story”²². Such tales were aimed at upper-class Jews, in order to present a “Life-Style for the Diaspora”²³, a sort of “training manual”²⁴ to help people reconcile their faith with active participation in a foreign court. More recently, the popular and satirical character of these stories has been emphasized because of the presence of certain elements of humor and irony²⁵. Consequently, the tales might function as “finely crafted novelistic satires of resistance designed to ridicule foreign kings and empires”²⁶.

At the same time, because of the late composition of the book, numerous allusions to older texts and characters have been identified in Daniel. In fact, the text is proposed as a good example of intra-biblical exegesis²⁷. The most evident resemblance in terms of structure, characterization, message, etc., is established with Joseph, the patriarch. Scholars have pointed out as many as eighteen plot similarities between Daniel 2 and Genesis 41²⁸. Parallels have also been found with Esther²⁹. However, the traits shared with King David are even more significant, both on a personal and narrative level, as we will see below.

2) *Structure of Daniel 2*

Different structural schemas have been proposed, some more detailed than others. Collins divides the narrative into six parts (vv. 1, 2-12, 13-16, 17-24, 25-45, 46-49)³⁰, while Hartman and Di Lella divide it into five

¹⁹ COLLINS, *Daniel* (1993), 38-52.

²⁰ HUMPHREYS, “A Life-Style for Diaspora”, 217.

²¹ HUMPHREYS, “A Life-Style for Diaspora”, 217-220.

²² DAVIES, *Daniel*, 50-55.

²³ HUMPHREYS, “A Life-Style for Diaspora”, 211.

²⁴ D.M. VALETA, “Court or Jester Tales? Resistance and Social Reality in Daniel 1-6”, *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 32 (2005) 309-324, here 311.

²⁵ D.M. VALETA, “The Satirical Nature of the Book of Daniel”, in *Apocalyptic in History and Tradition* (eds. C. ROWLAND – J. BARTON) (JSPSup 43; Sheffield 2002) 81-93.

²⁶ VALETA, “Court or Jester Tales?”, 309.

²⁷ KRATZ, “The Visions in Daniel”, 94. Despite this useful model of analysis for the Book of Daniel, I do not apply it in the paper, because of the more generic character of the internarrativity model, as we will see below.

²⁸ RINDGE, “Jewish Identity”, 86-89; LABONTÉ, “Gèneses 41 et Daniel 2”, 271-284.

²⁹ MILÁN, “¿Un Daniel polifónico?”, 351-352.

³⁰ COLLINS, *Daniel* (1993) 152-153.

parts (vv. 1-12, 13-28, 29-36a, 36b-45, 46-49) ³¹. Marconcini ³², Delcor ³³ and others prefer a simpler structure, established around the relationship between the king and the rest of the characters: the king and his wise men (vv. 1-13); Daniel and the king (vv. 14-45); and the king's reaction (vv. 46-49). In recent times, because of the preponderance of dialogue, A. Gianto has proposed reading ch. 2 as a drama in four acts ³⁴.

In view of the action of the characters, I prefer to establish a structure in five parts, in addition to an introduction (v. 1) and a conclusion (vv. 46-49).

v. 1: [*inside the court: ignorance of the king*] Introduction and initial situation. King's presentation and his trouble.

vv. 2-12: [*inside the court: lack of wisdom in Babylonian courtiers and their gods; absence of Daniel and the consequences*] Main complication. The king's dialogue with the wise men: three times he asks them to tell him both the content and the meaning of the dream, but all three times the wise men fail ³⁵. It seems "impossible" to meet the king's request. The king gives the order to have them executed.

vv. 13-16: [*inside the court and outside the court: Daniel's wisdom; Daniel before Arioch and the king, and the consequences*] Daniel in action. Daniel's dialogues with Arioch and with the king. The king gives Daniel more time to arrive at an interpretation but does not demand that he immediately detail the contents of the dream.

vv. 17-23: [*outside the court: wisdom of Daniel's God; Daniel with his companions before God, and the consequences*] The transforming action. Daniel's dialogue with his three companions and with his God: initial prayer, revelation to Daniel, and final prayer of thanksgiving.

vv. 24-25: [*outside the court and inside the court: Daniel's wisdom; Daniel before Arioch and the king*] Daniel returns to the court. Arioch's dialogues with Daniel and the king.

vv. 26-45: [*inside the court: Daniel's wisdom and Daniel's God; Daniel before the king*] Resolution. Daniel's dialogues with the king. Revelation of the contents of the dream and its interpretation.

³¹ HARTMAN – DI LELLA, *The Book of Daniel*, 143-151.

³² B. MARCONCINI, *Daniele*. Nuova versione, introduzione e commento (Milano 2004) 60.

³³ M. DELCOR, *Le livre de Daniel* (Paris 1971) 70.

³⁴ A. GIANTO, "Notes From a Reading of Daniel 2", *Sôfer mahîr*. Essays in Honour of Adrian Schenker (eds. Y. GOLDMAN – A. VAN DER KOOIJ – R. WEIS) (VTSup 110; Leiden 2006) 59-68.

³⁵ In Propp's study of tales, threefold repetition ("trebling") is particularly frequent: see P.J. MILNE, *Vladimir Propp and the Study of Structure in Hebrew Biblical Narrative* (BLS 13; Sheffield 1988) 81.

vv. 46-49: [*inside the court: the king's knowledge; Daniel and the consequences of the revelation*] New situation. Final dialogues and conclusion: the king recognizes Daniel and his God, and rewards him and his companions.

The structure revolves around Daniel, who is, in my view, the central figure of the story. As Fewel has pointed out, "Daniel himself will always eclipse Daniel's god"³⁶. Indeed, Daniel dominates the action with his entrances and exits from the court; he is the one who receives the revelation; he is also rewarded, and, thanks to him, his three companions prosper. He appears as the protagonist of the play of dialogues (vv. 13-49), and, even where he is not present, his appearance is anticipated (vv. 1-12). However, some scholars support the view that God is the genuine protagonist of the stories, mainly because there is no other character to whom more epithets are applied, and because "there is a connection between the expressions used to refer to God and some of the themes developed in Daniel"³⁷. In any case, the presence of God and his operation in the story are essential.

This arrangement of the text is also marked by the recurrence of the root ידע, used in relation to the king (vv. 3, 26), his servants (v. 9), Arioch (vv. 15, 25) Daniel (vv. 16, 17, 28-29, 45) and God (v. 23). However, only God (vv. 23, 28-29, 45; cf. vv. 9-11) and his servant Daniel (vv. 25, 26, 30) will be able to *make known* (in *haphel*) to the king the content and meaning of the dream.

The plot could be described as one of resolution, since the problem is successfully solved: Daniel saves himself and the lives of all Babylon's wise men, and he attains a position superior to the one he held at the beginning. However, as often happens in biblical stories, this plot is combined with another, a plot of revelation or of discovery, where the action is less important and the events narrated have a merely illustrative function³⁸. In other words, in this tale the events are in the service of a particular vision of both characters: Daniel and his God. Besides, there is a kind of "revelation" when Nebuchadnezzar realizes the power of Daniel and recognizes his God as the true God.

The story offers some surprises and contradictions. Apart from the unusual request of the king, which astonishes not only the magicians and

³⁶ D.N. FEWEL, *Circle of Sovereignty*. Plotting Politics in the Book of Daniel (Nashville, TN 1991) 118.

³⁷ T. LI, "The Characterization of God in the Aramaic Chapters of Daniel", *"For You Have Strengthened Me"*, 107-116, here 110-111.

³⁸ See J.L. SKA, *Our Fathers Have Told Us*. Introduction to the Analysis of Hebrew Narratives (Subsidia Biblica 13; Roma 1990) 18-19.

soothsayers but also the reader, the first striking feature is that the king does not initially summon Daniel, even though in the previous chapter he is considered an especially gifted wise man (Dan 1,19-20). It is similarly surprising how Daniel gains access to the king with such ease (Dan 2,16; against 2,14-15.24-25). The last scene is also shocking: the king of Babylon, king of kings (Ezek 26,7), servant of the Lord (Jer 25,9; 27,6; 43,10), conqueror of Jerusalem and destroyer of the Temple (2 Kings 24–25; Jeremiah 52), prostrates himself with his face to the ground and offers libations and incense, as if Daniel were a god (Dan 2,46). Although the act of prostration can be understood in different ways (respect, as in Gen 42,6; 43,26; 44,14; gratitude, as in 1 Sam 20,41; intercession, as in Ezek 9,8; or adoration, as in Gen 17,3; Ezek 1,28; 3,23), in this case the sense of adoration is emphasized. Indeed, along with oblations and incense, the root סגד is used, which is employed repeatedly in ch. 3 in the sense of adoring Nebuchadnezzar's statue (vv. 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18, 28). In my opinion, this is an ironic anticipation of what the king will later require from the three young men.

Overdoing the quasi-divine characterization of Daniel may conceal an authorial intention to emphasize the divine dimension of the fifth kingdom, namely, the kingdom of God, with Daniel as its main herald. Thus, the pagan royal “worship” of Daniel would be in fulfillment of the Scripture: “Kings will be your foster-fathers and their princesses, your foster-mothers. They will fall prostrate before you, faces to the ground, and lick the dust at your feet. And you will know that I am YHWH; those who hope in me will not be disappointed” (Is 49,23; see also Isa 45,14; 49,7; 60,14; and Ps 72,11) ³⁹.

3) *The Statue (Dan 2,31-35.37-45)*

The detailed description of the statue (צלם in Aramaic; in Hebrew פסל) found in Daniel 2 is something of a rarity in the Bible. What is common is the explicit prohibition against making carved images or statues (Exod 20,4; Deut 4,16.23.25; 5,8). At any rate, the statue in Daniel 2 constitutes a clear reference to idolatry, especially if we consider Daniel 3 and the fact that in those times there was a recurring use of statues as idols in both private and public spheres (see 2 Kgs 21,7 and 2 Chr 33,7).

There are possible echoes of the statue in the prophetic images likening kings to tall and strong trees, which, by the action of God, are made

³⁹ C.L. SEOW, “From Mountain to Mountain: The Reign of God in Daniel 2”, *A God So Near. Essays on Old Testament Theology in Honor of Patrick D. Miller* (eds. B.A. STRAWN – N.R. BOWEN) (Winona Lake, IN 2003) 355-374, here 360.

small and humiliated (Ezek 17,22-24; 31,1-18; Amos 2,9). There is also a certain resemblance to the images of Second Isaiah that relate the kings of the nations with idolatry (especially chs. 44–47)⁴⁰. However, as far as the peculiar configuration of Daniel's statue is concerned, nothing similar is to be found in the Bible.

This symbol is more frequent in extra-biblical cultures. Some scholars have seen the antecedents of the image of Daniel's statue in the famous colossi of Rhodes and Thebes⁴¹. Similarly, an image of metals in descending order according to their value and their corresponding identification with successive kingdoms was already known in antiquity. Indeed, Hesiod (*Works and the Days* 199-201), Ovid (*Metamorphoses* I, 89-150) and Polybius (*Histories* 38,22) all use this image. It seems that behind this image lies a theology of history similar to Greek historiography⁴². Apart from the Hellenistic world, other influences — Persian or Mesopotamian — have also been considered as possible sources⁴³.

In Daniel, the statue symbolizes the power of all the empires of the world and the idols they create. In the interpretation of the dream, the materials, listed in a similar sequence, represent a historical succession of four kingdoms (מלכו in Aramaic), into which will irrupt a fifth. This kingdom will destroy the others and establish a new order, namely, the kingdom of God, which will be symbolized by the mysterious stone that is turned into a mountain that fills the whole earth. In sum, the kingdom of God pervades the book of Daniel⁴⁴.

As is well known, the successive kingdoms have been understood differently, with two types of hypotheses proposed: one that identifies each material of the statue with the kings of Babylon (this would correspond to the oldest abbreviated version of the story)⁴⁵, and one that relates them to kings or kingdoms of different empires. The last hypothesis has two variants: the so-called Greek hypothesis (the most dominant at present)⁴⁶, where the last kingdom is identified with Alexander the Great and his

⁴⁰ I. FRÖHLICH, "Daniel 2 and Deutero-Isaiah", *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*, 266-270.

⁴¹ H.F. SIEGMAN, "The Stone Hewn from the Mountain (Daniel 2)", *CBQ* 18 (1956) 365-379, here 366.

⁴² See P. NISKANEN, *The Human and the Divine in History*. Herodotus and the Book of Daniel (London 2004) 27-51.

⁴³ A. MOMIGLIANO, "Daniel and the Greek Theory of Imperial Succession", *Essays on Ancient and Modern Judaism* (ed. S. BERTI) (Chicago, IL 1994) 29-35, here 34-36.

⁴⁴ SEOW, "From Mountain to Mountain", 355-374; G. PFANDL, "Interpretations of the Kingdom of God in Daniel 2:44", *AUSS* 34 (1996) 249-268.

⁴⁵ P.R. DAVIES, "Daniel Chapter Two", *JTS* 27 (1976) 392-401, here 399.

⁴⁶ COLLINS, *Daniel* (1993) 166-170.

successors (the Babylonians, Medes, Persians and Greeks, in the whole sequence) and the Roman hypothesis (common in antiquity among both Jews and Christians)⁴⁷, in which the last kingdom corresponds to Rome (the Babylonians, Medes-Persians, Greeks and Romans).

4) *The Stone (Dan 2,34-35.45)*

The stone (אבן) that knocks down the statue has a mysterious character. Initially, we do not know whence it falls (v. 34). Later on, the mountain from which it falls is not specified (v. 45); and ultimately, the meanings of both elements, the non-human hand (vv. 34 and 45) and the stone turned into a great mountain that fills the whole earth (v. 35), remain obscure. As a result, the stone has been the object of multiple and varied interpretations⁴⁸. Due to its messianic resonances, its influence is great on the New Testament and the first Christian interpreters⁴⁹. It has also been related to other biblical and extra-biblical passages⁵⁰. At this point, it will only be possible to mention some of these passages, since the focus of this investigation is this stone's relation to the one thrown by David against Goliath.

According to the text, the image of the stone that strikes the statue and reduces it to dust, establishing the fifth and definitive kingdom, suggests that God himself will raise that kingdom up (v. 44). Indeed, the stone not cut by human hands (vv. 34 and 45), implies a divine intervention. Likewise, the expression "from the mountain" (v. 45) suggests the place where God manifests himself with power (Horeb-Sinai: Exod 3,1; 19,3; 1 Kgs 19,8; Ps 68,9) and where he has his dwelling place (Zion: Isa 2,2-3; Micah 4,1-2; Pss 2,6; 48,2-3; 68,17)⁵¹.

If we follow the same logic of the text, which identifies each metal of the statue with a kingdom/king, the stone that destroys the statue might originally symbolize Cyrus, a character mentioned both at the beginning (1,21) and at the end (6,29) of the stories. This king would function as the instrument used by God to destroy the pagan kingdoms, themselves symbolized by the idol. Such an interpretation coincides with the perspective presented in Deutero-Isaiah, where Cyrus appears as the Lord's

⁴⁷ SEOW, "From Mountain to Mountain", 355.

⁴⁸ See L. SANTOPAOLLO, *Sogno, Segno e Storia*. Genesi e Fenomenologia dell'Immaginario in Dan 2-6 (AnBib 223; Roma 2019) 43-63.

⁴⁹ See the recent study by A. DE LA TORRE MUNILLA, *Primeras interpretaciones del sueño de Nabucodonosor* (Dissertationes theologicae 37; Madrid 2021).

⁵⁰ Cf. G.K. BEALE, *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of St. John* (Lanham, MD 1984) 12-305.

⁵¹ SIEGMAN, "The Stone Hewn", 369.

anointed and his shepherd, and as the one who will fulfill his will (Isa 44,28 and 45,1-5) ⁵².

The stone that becomes a mountain (טור, which is the corresponding Aramaic term for the Hebrew צור) has also been related to Mount Zion ⁵³, where the Lord will reign (Isa 37,32; 11,9; 24,23; 25,6) and where all nations will come (Isa 2,2; 11,9; Micah 4,1-2) ⁵⁴. In a narrower sense, it suggests the Temple, both earthly ⁵⁵ and eschatological ⁵⁶. The stone has also been associated with the different meanings of the word “rock” (God, the king, the people, etc.), according to a fluctuating terminology ⁵⁷.

Nevertheless, in light of the son of man vision of Daniel 7, the image of the stone can be understood as a metaphor for the establishment of the kingdom of God, which will destroy all pagan kingdoms and last forever. The indestructible character of this kingdom (2,44 and 7,14), foreshadowed in the way Daniel and his companions are shielded from damage (3,25 and 6,23), contrasts with its destructive power (cf. Isa 41,15-16.25) ⁵⁸ and the ruin of the other kingdoms (the fallen statue: 2,44; the felled tree: 4,20; the dismembered beast: 7,11) ⁵⁹. This interpretation goes hand in hand with the messianic vision of the stone, which is already present in later Judaism (*Midrash Tanhumah*, Terumah 6), in the NT (Mark 12,10-11; Matt 21,42-44; Luke 20,17-18; Rom 9,32-33; 1 Pet 2,6-8; and also Mark 4,30-32, Matt 24,2), as well as among the early Christian commentators, where the image is applied to Christ and to his universal and eternal reign ⁶⁰.

Last, the unquestionable connection between the stone and idolatry must be mentioned, first, because of the common association of stones and mountains with divinities and sacred places in the Ancient Near East ⁶¹, and second, because this writing seeks to encourage the Jews living in exile to be aware of the danger of idols. It makes sense, therefore, that the destruction of the statue, which represents the pagan kingdoms

⁵² Cf. I. FRÖHLICH, “Daniel 2 and Deutero-Isaiah”, *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*, 266-268.

⁵³ A. LACOCQUE, *The Book of Daniel* (London 1979) 124.

⁵⁴ C.L. SEOW, *Daniel* (WBC; Louisville, KY 2003) 44.

⁵⁵ G.K. BEALE, *The Temple and the Church's Mission. A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God* (NSBT, Downers Grove, IL 2004) 144-153.

⁵⁶ BEALE, *The Temple*, 181-187.

⁵⁷ See H.-J. FABRY, “צור”, *TDOT* 12 (2003) 311-321.

⁵⁸ SEOW, *Daniel*, 44.

⁵⁹ See C.L. SEOW, “The Rule of God in the Book of Daniel”, *David and Zion. Biblical Studies in Honor of J.J.M. Roberts* (eds. B.F. BATTO – K.L. ROBERTS) (Winona Lake, IN 2004) 219-246, here 226-229.

⁶⁰ See R. BODENMANN, *Naissance d'une exégèse. Daniel dans l'Église ancienne des trois premiers siècles* (BGBE 28; Tübingen 1986).

⁶¹ KLINGBEIL, “Rocking the Mountain”, 131-135.

and their idols, comes through the action of a stone, especially given that the punishment for idolatry was itself stoning (Deut 13,6-10 and Lev 24,10-16).

II. DAVID AND GOLIATH (1 SAM 17,1-58)

1) *The Story in its Context*

The story is placed between two overlapping narratives: the fall of Saul (1 Samuel 13–31) and the rise of David (1 Samuel 16 – 2 Samuel 7) ⁶². Both roughly correspond to two of the three independent narratives that seem to lie behind the compositional history of the book of Samuel, namely, the Ark Narrative, the Saul Cycle, and the History of David's Rise ⁶³.

Therefore, 1 Samuel 17 must be read in light of the events narrated in the preceding chapters, beginning with the rejection of Saul (1 Sam 13,14 and 15,11.23) and the anointing of David (1 Sam 16,12-13), up to his successful entry into the court of the future king as Saul's armor-bearer and personal musician (1 Sam 16,14-23). In these chapters David's heart (1 Sam 16,7) along with his good-looking appearance (1 Sam 16,12.18) are explicitly mentioned. Both qualities will be mentioned again in ch. 17 (vv. 28 and 42) ⁶⁴.

The story of the ark's capture and seven-month sojourn in Philistine territory (1 Samuel 4–6) also prefigures some of the themes that will emerge in the David and Goliath scene. Thus, the Dagon statue falling (forward) "face down on the ground before the ark of YHWH" (נפל לפניו) (1 Sam 5,3), its head and hands cut off (5,4), is reminiscent of Goliath falling (forward) before David (ויפל על-פניו ארצה, 17,49), with his head cut off (17,51.54). Some other similarities include the motif of the contest between gods, with victory for the God of Israel, and the presence of the Philistines as the enemies of Israel.

Two more texts are mirrored in the scene of David and Goliath: the contrast between the Philistines' weapons and those of the Israelites (1 Sam 13,19-22) and the courageous raid against the Philistines (described as uncircumcised in 1 Sam 14,1-14) by Jonathan and his armor-bearer,

⁶² M.T. DAVIS, "David and Goliath. Story of", *EBR* 6 (2013) 243-244.

⁶³ P.K. MCCARTER JR., *I Samuel* (AB 8; New York 1980) 23-30.

⁶⁴ J.P. FOKKELMAN, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel*. A Full Interpretation Based on Stylistic and Structural Analyses. Vol. 2: The Crossing Fates (I Sam. 13–31 & II Sam. 1) (SSN 23; Assen 1986) 143-145; 203-208.

who are convinced that God will grant victory despite the obvious disadvantage (1 Sam 14,6) ⁶⁵.

Finally, two later episodes could be added: the Nabal scene (1 Samuel 25) and the Shimei incident (2 Sam 16,5-13). In the first example, Nabal, as a revived Goliath, after despising David (1 Sam 25,10; 1 Sam 17,42-43), dies when a stone struck his heart (וַיָּמָת לָבוֹ בְּקֶרְבוֹ וְהוּא הָיָה לְאֶבֶן, 1 Sam 25,37). In the second text, Shimei, a man of the same clan as Saul's family, curses David and throws stones at him (2 Sam 16,5-13). Abishai's response, calling this man a "dead dog" and asking permission from David to cut his head off, also brings the David and Goliath story immediately to mind (2 Sam 16,9; 1 Sam 17,43; 24,15).

The immediate context of the story is in ch. 16. In fact, some scholars consider that the story of David and Goliath properly incorporates chs. 16–18, since the events in these chapters are closely related to each other, and there is a logical progression in the narrative, which is made more apparent in the Greek version ⁶⁶. For example, in chs. 16–17 three choices are narrated: God needs a king and chooses David (Saul sends for him: 1 Sam 16,11-12); Saul needs someone to calm his evil spirit and chooses David (Saul sends for him: 1 Sam 16,19); the king's army needs someone to fight Goliath and David volunteers (Saul sends for him: 1 Sam 17,31) ⁶⁷.

The history of ch. 17 is complex ⁶⁸. Suffice to say that it shares the well-known problems of transmission of the first book of Samuel, especially with regard to the textual differences between the Hebrew and Greek versions ⁶⁹. In the David and Goliath story, the main difficulty is that the MT seems to be the fusion of two different stories: one, shorter, which could be called the story of the victorious soldier, and another longer version, the story of the heroic shepherd boy ⁷⁰. The LXX^b presents the shorter version of the story (1 Sam 17,1-11.32-40.42-48a.49.51-54), while the

⁶⁵ For a wider context, see D.W. GOODING, "An Approach to the Literary and Textual Problems in the David-Goliath Story: 1 Sam 16–18", *The Story of David and Goliath. Textual and Literary Criticism. Papers of a Joint Research Venture* (eds. D. BARTHELEMY – D.W. GOODING – J. LUST – E. TOV) (OBO 73; Göttingen 1986) 63-66.

⁶⁶ J.W. WESSELIUS, "A New View on the Relation between Septuagint and Masoretic Text in the Story of David and Goliath", *Early Christian Literature and Intertextuality. Vol. 2, Exegetical Studies* (eds. C.A. EVANS – H.D. ZACHARIAS) (SSEJC 15; London 2009) 5-26.

⁶⁷ GOODING, "An Approach to the Literary", 64-65.

⁶⁸ See J. LUST, "The Story of David and Goliath in Hebrew and in Greek", *The Story of David and Goliath*, 5-18; E. TOV, "The Nature of the Differences between MT and the LXX", *The Story of David and Goliath*, 19-46.

⁶⁹ KYLE, *1 Samuel*, 5-11.

⁷⁰ W. DIETRICH, "Die Erzählungen von David und Goliath in I Sam 17", *ZAW* 108 (1996) 172-191, here 179.

MT and other Greek versions have the complete story (1 Sam 17,12-31. 41,48b.50.55-58; and some scholars add 1 Sam 18,1-5).

There is no agreement among specialists regarding the date of composition ⁷¹. Some suppose an ancient origin as early as the tenth century B.C.E., considering it a faithful narration of a historical battle, and therefore close in time to the events narrated. Others argue for a delay in writing until around the end of the more recent Persian period (fourth century B.C.E.). It seems that the deuteronomistic history must have played a significant role in the composition ⁷². In any case, it is usually affirmed that the battle of David and Goliath would be secondary to the original story, which would have simply narrated the battle between Philistines and Israelites. Later on, probably in the period of deuteronomistic redaction, the story of David and Goliath would have been revised, and the final details added ⁷³.

In my opinion, the final redaction of the story of David and Goliath certainly predates the definitive stories of Daniel. However, it might be fairly close in time to the original story of the dream, perhaps between the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.E. To the literary, linguistic and theological arguments highlighted by Rofé ⁷⁴ can be added another significant factor, which is the success of the story: it is probable that this tale was told and retold many times for some centuries, becoming one of the best-known tales of the Scriptures that were available in the Maccabean period ⁷⁵.

That David and Goliath's story was vivid in the time of the Maccabees is indicated by the author of 1 Maccabees, who uses language similar to the books of Samuel in order to portray Judas as a latter-day David ⁷⁶. In this way, Judas is pictured as one who extends the glory of his people and protects the host with his sword (1 Macc 3,3; 2 Sam 8,1-14). He also

⁷¹ On this point, see ROFÉ, "David Overcomes Goliath", 73-87.

⁷² S. ISSER, *The Sword of Goliath. David in Heroic Literature* (Studies in Biblical Literature 6; Atlanta, GA 2003) 5-21; R. POLZIN, *Samuel and the Deuteronomist. A Literary Study of the Deuteronomistic History. Part Two: 1 Samuel* (Bloomington – Indianapolis, IN 1993) 9-17.

⁷³ KYLE, *1 Samuel*, 12-30.

⁷⁴ ROFÉ, "David Overcomes Goliath", 76-98.

⁷⁵ It is not possible to go deeper into this question in this paper, for I have chosen to attend to the final-real text (in the MT version), as Alter and others have defended: R. ALTER, *The David Story. A Translation with Commentary of 1 and 2 Samuel* (New York – London 1999); B.J.M. JOHNSON, *Reading David and Goliath in Greek and Hebrew. A Literary Approach* (FAT 2/82; Tübingen 2015) 12-13. As is well known, focusing on the literary dimension of the biblical text does not necessarily imply neglecting the diachronic perspective. Rather, it analyzes the different communicative situations, trying to go beyond the original communicational context and attend also to its successive re-readings. See W. PIKOR, "A Prophet as a Witness to His Call: A Narrative Key to the Reading of Prophetic Call Narratives", *Scripta Theologica* 52 (2020) 73-95.

⁷⁶ J.A. GOLDSTEIN, *1 Maccabees. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 41; New York 1976) 260.

takes the sword of Apollonius after killing him and uses it in subsequent battles (1 Macc 3,12; 1 Sam 17,51; 21,9-10). Furthermore, in his deeds he acts like a lion and achieves great fame (1 Macc 3,4.7.9.26; 1 Sam 17,34-38; 2 Sam 8,13) because deliverance is accomplished by his hand (1 Macc 3,6; 1 Sam 17,47; 2 Sam 3,18). Judas also inquires of the Lord, the savior God (1 Macc 4,11; 1 Sam 17,47; 2 Sam 22,47), before facing battles (1 Sam 23,2; 30.8; 2 Sam 5,19.23; 1 Macc 3,46-60). He even recalls in his prayer the victory won by David against the mighty warrior and, consequently, against the Philistines (1 Macc 4,30-33). In sum, Judas acts at every point as “the exemplary biblical warrior”⁷⁷. At the same time, there are at least two references to Goliath. The first one is the description that Judas was like a giant when he put on his breastplate (1 Macc 3,3). The second one has to do with the death of Antiochus IV, related in the Books of Maccabees several times but not in the same way. According to one of the accounts (2 Macc 1,13-16)⁷⁸, the infamous king died in a temple, crushed by stones and beheaded.

With regard to the literary genre, different possibilities have been proposed. Some authors assign a genre to each of the two versions of the story. Consequently, the longer text of the TM has been classified as a “hero saga”, while the shorter version of LXX^b is considered a “contest legend”⁷⁹. Some other scholars, considering the peculiar features of this narrative (the meticulous description of the facts, the idealized presentation of David, the unrealistic plot, etc.), refer to the story as a *Märchen*⁸⁰. Rofé, in a more specific way, claims that the story transcends the boundaries of these genres, since the tale is about “a known hero who acts in well-defined historical circumstances”⁸¹. He thus prefers to consider the story part of a group of “tales concerning the hero’s *beginnings*”, that is, “stories which presuppose the presence of his charisma and ask where it came from and how it came to be revealed”⁸². Furthermore, the story has been characterized as a “romantic epic” and, as with the Book of Daniel, Propp’s model of heroic fairy tale has been applied⁸³. Finally, this passage has been understood as an example of a type-scene of single

⁷⁷ D.J. HARRINGTON, “The Books of First and Second Maccabees”, *New Collegeville Bible Commentary*. Old Testament (ed. D. DURKEN) (Collegeville, MN 2015) 777-781, 830.

⁷⁸ In 2 Macc 9,1-17 and 1 Maccabees 6 a different version of his death is related.

⁷⁹ S.J. DE VRIES, “David’s Victory over the Philistine as Saga and as Legend”, *JBL* 92 (1973) 23-36.

⁸⁰ ISSER, *The Sword of Goliath*, 22-45, 124.

⁸¹ ROFÉ, “David Overcomes Goliath”, 66.

⁸² ROFÉ, “David Overcomes Goliath”, 77.

⁸³ H. JASON, “The Story of David and Goliath: A Folk Epic?”, *Bib* 60 (1979) 36-70.

combat⁸⁴. Perhaps it is easier to consider this scene in a more general way, as an “epic drama”⁸⁵, since, as Alter points out, this chapter “is as close as the Hebrew Bible comes to an ‘epic’ presentation of its materials”⁸⁶.

Lastly, David is also reminiscent of other biblical characters. Among others, he has been rightly compared to Samson (Judg 13,1 – 16,31 with 1 Samuel 16–23)⁸⁷ and to Saul (1 Sam 10,24), understood here in an antithetical sense as a second Goliath (cf. Saul’s great height in 1 Sam 9,2 and 10,23)⁸⁸. Similarities have also been noted between the occupations of Saul and David before they were anointed kings⁸⁹. However, like Daniel, David resembles the patriarch Joseph⁹⁰. He also rises quickly in social status thanks to his success in all his undertakings (1 Sam 18,14–15 and Gen 39,3.23). Likewise, both the David and Joseph stories emphasize that the Lord is with the protagonists (כִּי־יְהוָה יִהְיֶה עִמּוֹ: 1 Sam 18,12.14; 2 Sam 5,10; 1 Chr 11,9; Gen 39,3.21 [Acts 7:9]) or a similar formula (1 Sam 16,13)⁹¹. Both tales also agree on three final points: the fathers’ concern for the sons who are outside the home, either tending the cattle (Gen 37,12–14) or on the battlefield (1 Sam 17,17–20); the son who remains at home and who then was sent with food for his brothers, or was sent with the task of bringing news of them to the father (1 Sam 17,17–18 and Gen 37,14); and the son who will no longer return home (Gen 37,32–36 and 1 Sam 18,2).

3) *Structure of 1 Samuel 17*

Most scholars divide this story into six scenes: vv. 1–11, 12–31, 32–40, 41–47, 48–51, and 52–58⁹². Fokkelman agrees on the number of scenes

⁸⁴ M.D. PRESS, “A Single Combat Type-Scene in the Hebrew Bible?”, *Hebrew Studies* 57 (2016) 93–115, here 94–95; R. DE VAUX, “Single Combat in the Old Testament”, in his *The Bible and the Ancient Near East* (Garden City, NY 1971) 122–135.

⁸⁵ B.C. BIRCH, “The First and Second Books of Samuel. Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections”, *The New Interpreter’s Bible* (Nashville, TN 1998) II:947–1383, here 1108.

⁸⁶ R. ALTER, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (Rev. ed.; New York 2011) 262.

⁸⁷ J.W. HERBST, “Valuing Leadership and Love: David exceeding Samson”, *JSOT* 43 (2019) 491–505.

⁸⁸ M. MICHAEL, “Is Saul the Second Goliath of 1 Samuel? The Rhetoric & Polemics of the David/Goliath Story in 1 Samuel”, *JSOT* 34 (2020) 221–244.

⁸⁹ D. RUDMAN, “The Commissioning Stories of Saul and David as Theological Allegory”, *VT* 50 (2000) 519–530.

⁹⁰ ALTER, *The David Story*, 114; IDEM, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 207–208.

⁹¹ The expression is also applied to other biblical characters: Judg 2,18; 1 Sam 3,19; 2 Chr 1,1; Dan 4,5.6.15; 5,11.14; etc.

⁹² BIRCH, “The First and Second Books of Samuel”, 1109–1113; DIETRICH, “Die Erzählungen von David und Goliath”, 172–191.

but changes the distribution somewhat and adds vv. 1-5 of ch. 18 to the last scene ⁹³. According to the action of the characters, I have adopted the following structure:

vv. 1-3: *Introduction*. The initial situation. An overview from a spatial perspective that will characterize the whole story: the armies arranged in front of each other on two mountains, and in the middle, the valley (1 Sam 17,3) ⁹⁴. This arrangement is a preview of parallel encounters in the text: Israel and the Philistines, David and Goliath, YHWH and Dagon, Saul (the present king in decline) and David (the potential king in ascent) ⁹⁵.

vv. 4-11: *Goliath before Saul's army and the consequences. Absence of David*. The main complication. The giant comes out of the Philistine ranks and challenges Saul and his troops for 40 days, twice a day. The army of Israel becomes very frightened.

vv. 12-31: *David before Saul's army and the consequences*. The action is paused and the narrator introduces the hero (vv. 12-15) ⁹⁶. After showing up on the battlefield by chance, David takes charge of the situation and accepts Goliath's challenge. Despite his brother's opposition, David's courageous words reach the king's ears, who calls him into his presence.

vv. 32-40: *David before King Saul and the consequences*. The transforming action. In contrast to the people's fear and cowardice, David's courage and trust in YHWH is highlighted. Before defeating Goliath, he must first overcome Saul's opposition. David then prepares himself for battle.

vv. 41-47: *David meets Goliath face to face*. This constitutes one of the many preparatory scenes that ascend toward the summit of the narrative. In fact, from v. 20 until the beginning of the fight (v. 51), the scenes increase in narrative intensity until they reach the climax ⁹⁷. The pre-fight dialogues are placed in parallel, so that to Goliath's taunts and insults (vv. 43-44), David responds with a threat (vv. 45-47) ⁹⁸. In contrast to Goliath's contempt for David, David's confidence in God's power is highlighted.

⁹³ FOKKELMAN, *Narrative Art*, 145, 190-201.

⁹⁴ ALTER, *The David Story*, 101.

⁹⁵ DIETRICH, "Die Erzählungen von David und Goliath", 173.

⁹⁶ On "exposition" as one of the different moments of the plot in narrative analysis, see SKA, *Our Fathers*, 21-25.

⁹⁷ SKA, *Our Fathers*, 26-27.

⁹⁸ LUST, "The Story of David and Goliath", 11-12.

vv. 48-53: *David and Goliath in combat and the consequences*. Development and outcome of the combat. Goliath “falls on his face to the ground” because of the impact of the stone and David cuts off his head. David’s victory over Goliath leads to Israel’s victory over the Philistines.

vv. 17,54 – 18,5: *David before the king and the consequences*. Epilogue. Final situation. David returns to the king’s presence and his identity is revealed. He remains in the king’s service (18,2). Instead of his former duties (16,21-23), he will be designated the head of the army (18,5), but he does not get the promised reward (17,25) until later (18,22-27); his reputation and the devotion of others will grow from that moment on (18,1.3.4.5-7).

This is probably the best known and most detailed story of the David cycle ⁹⁹. Although the story turns around the two combatants, the protagonist is undoubtedly David. Saul also plays a significant role, especially as a contrasting figure in the movement of descent/ascent and in giving up/acquiring authority. Likewise, the role of God in the story is essential. Thus, the narrator does not seek to resolve the battle immediately ¹⁰⁰. On the contrary, he is interested in making known to the whole world “that there is a God in Israel” (1 Sam 17,46) and that no one can defy or mock YHWH. As a result, more than a battle between two men or two armies, it becomes a battle of faith.

On the other hand, the speeches in the story are as important as the action ¹⁰¹. As Alter has noted, in contrast with David’s silence in ch. 16, David here “shows himself a master of rhetoric” ¹⁰². Indeed, it could be said that the battle is also fought at the discursive level, since David will have to confront three characters through his own words: his older brother, King Saul, and Goliath ¹⁰³. In all three cases he will be victorious.

In the arrangement of this story, knowledge is also crucial: Goliath does not *know* why Israel’s army is there in battle array (1 Sam 17,8); Jesse wants to *find out* how his sons are (vv. 17-18); David *ignores* the reward for killing Goliath (vv. 26-27); he even *knows* nothing about the giant (v. 26); Eliab wants to *know* why David came (v. 28); Saul *realizes* David is not able to fight against Goliath (v. 33); yet the king does not *know* whose son David is (vv. 55-58); David *makes known* to Saul that he is able

⁹⁹ BIRCH, “The First and Second Books of Samuel”, 1108.

¹⁰⁰ SKA, *Our Fathers*, 18-19.

¹⁰¹ BIRCH, “The First and Second Books of Samuel”, 1114.

¹⁰² ALTER, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 263.

¹⁰³ DIETRICH, “Die Erzählungen von David und Goliath”, 175.

to fight (vv. 34-37); David faces Goliath “so that the whole world *may know* (יֵדַע) that there is a God in Israel” (1 Sam 17,46; cf. v. 47).

The plot can be described as one of resolution, since, as in Daniel, the problem is solved, and the people who are threatened with death survive and win the battle. As occurs in Daniel also, this plot is combined with a revelation or discovery¹⁰⁴. Furthermore, there is a certain kind of “revelation” when Saul, the Philistines and Israel become aware of David’s power.

Likewise, as seen in Daniel, there are also illogical elements in this story. Perhaps the most striking is the king’s lack of knowledge about David’s identity and origin (1 Sam 17,55-58), even though shortly before both characters had already met and the king himself found out that David comes from the tribe of Judah (1 Sam 16,18-23). Another surprising aspect is the king’s attitude in allowing a shepherd — a young man without weapons and without combat experience — to confront the experienced giant in a fight with such important consequences. Finally, it is also curious that David kills Goliath twice, first with the stone (v. 50) and then with the sword (v. 51).

3) *Goliath and the Stone (1 Samuel 17)*

In the narrative, Goliath is only called by name twice (1 Sam 17,4,23). He is usually referred to instead as “the Philistine” (up to twenty-eight times), sometimes qualified with the word “uncircumcised” (1 Sam 17,26,36). Emphasizing his anonymity, besides avoiding confusion with Elhanan (2 Sam 21,19), might serve the purpose of underlining the Philistine giant’s function of representing a nation traditionally hostile to Israel, and in a broad sense, the rest of the nations. At the same time, applying to Goliath the term “uncircumcised” highlights the question of identity and religion.

Consequently, the Philistine signals a real threat to Israel on several levels: the political sphere through his attack on the newly constituted monarchy; the religious dimension by mocking Israel’s God; and the realm of identity, by challenging Israel’s status as God’s chosen people. In the end, Goliath is a symbol of the crises that the people of Israel will have to face in the future in their relationships with the nations, such as the persecution of Antiochus IV. However, beyond this, Goliath embodies the true enemy of God’s people, namely, idolatry.

¹⁰⁴ SKA, *Our Fathers*, 19.

The exhaustive description of the giant and the detailed account of his weapons are unusual in the Bible ¹⁰⁵. In addition to the breastplate, which weighs sixty kgs, he is carrying a bronze javelin (its tip weighs six kgs), a bronze helmet and bronze greaves on his legs. In total, he could be carrying as much as seventy-five kgs. Goliath's height is also disproportionate. According to the MT, it is six cubits and a span, equivalent to three meters. Although the Greek versions reduce the measurement to four cubits and a span (about two meters), it is still a considerable height.

The magnificent figure of Goliath contrasts with the insignificance of David, who is presented as a young good-looking man (1 Sam 17,33.42), probably short of stature (1 Sam 16,7; 17,14) and with no combat experience (1 Sam 17,33.39). However, his bravery (1 Sam 16,18) and strength (1 Sam 17,35) are emphasized.

Nevertheless, the contrast with Goliath is best noted in relation to his equipment. In fact, David goes to the battle almost without any armaments, rejecting even the helmet, armor and sword offered by the king (v. 39). He confronts the giant only with the things that he used as a shepherd to drive away the wild beasts, namely, a staff, a sling and some stones kept in a shepherd's bag (v. 40), a far cry from the seventy-five kgs of the giant's armament. Although the stone could be effective as a weapon if a person were sufficiently skilled (2 Chr 26,14; Judg 20,16), at first glance it does not seem it will be an equal fight. In contrast to Goliath, the giant, heavily armed soldier, David appears on the field as a shepherd, in keeping with the way he is portrayed throughout the whole chapter (1 Sam 17,15.20.28.34.40).

The only description of David's armament is of the sling (v. 50) and five smooth stones, which he chooses "from the river" (v. 40) and puts in his shepherd's bag. By detailing the number of the stones, a symbolic meaning (four + one) could be implied. If that is the case, it might connect with the book of Daniel, particularly with the metals of the statue (four) and the stone (one) of ch. 2, and with the vision of the beasts (four) and of the son of man (one) of Daniel 7. These tales share a similar context, in that they refer to an enemy who wages wars politically and religiously against Israel.

Therefore, the victory against the Philistine could be understood as the first step in David becoming the future shepherd of Israel. Just as Goliath is identified as one of those wild beasts that stalk the flock (v. 36 and, ironically, also v. 43), so the people are seen as the flock that David must

¹⁰⁵ ALTER, *The David Story*, 101-102; IDEM, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 149.

guard and defend from that moment on, with no weapons other than confidence in the Lord (v. 45).

III. DAVID AND DANIEL: CONNECTING POINTS

At this point, it is easy to recognize many elements in common between the two stories. First of all, the hero is described in a similar way: a young man (Dan 1,4.17: ילד and Susanna (Th) 1,45: παιδάριον; 1 Sam 17,33.42: נער), good-looking (Dan 1,4: וטובי מראה; 1 Sam 16,12: וטוב ראי and 1 Sam 17,42: עמי-יפה מרא) and gifted with exceptional knowledge. Although this characteristic is more prominent in Daniel than in David, the wisdom of both figures is understood as superior and quasi-divine (Dan 1,17.20; 2,23; 5,11.14; 8,19; cf. also Susanna and Bel; 2 Sam 14,17.20). Actually, this theme is so dominant in the David cycle that “the stories of Saul and David interlock antithetically on the theme of knowledge”¹⁰⁶.

Royal status will also constitute a common feature of the two characters, although at the beginning they differ in their lineage: David is a shepherd (1 Sam 16,11; 17,15) while Daniel may have come from a noble or even a royal family (Dan 1,3). In fact, later traditions point out that Daniel was one of the descendants of King Zedekiah (b. Sanh. 93b, and Josephus, *Ant.* X.X.1).

Both David and Daniel are exiled Hebrews, which is how the text describes Daniel explicitly (Dan 1,3-6; 2,25; 5,13; 6,14). In a sense David also experiences exile: initially he is displaced to the field to tend the flock while his brothers are being presented to Samuel (1 Sam 16,11). Later on, he will have to leave the kingdom because of Saul’s persecution (1 Samuel 18–23).

Likewise, both characters reach the court thanks to an extraordinary ability that is useful and pleasing to the king: music (1 Sam 16,16-23) and wisdom (Dan 1,17-20). Afterwards, both will prosper in the court after performing an astonishing action that is understood as a gift from God (1 Sam 17,45-47 and Dan 2,28.30.48). Both stories represent, furthermore, a turning point in the future relations of the two characters with their rulers: disaffection and separation between Saul and David (1 Sam 13,14; 16,7); and devotion and closeness between Nebuchadnezzar and Daniel (Dan 2,46-49). Finally, the kings both seem unaware of these two characters (Dan 2,25; 1 Sam 17,55), even though they have previously entered their service (Dan 1,19-20; 1 Sam 16,21-23).

¹⁰⁶ ALTER, *The David Story*, xix-xx.

Moreover, the two figures are enigmatic in terms of their historicity. Many scholars consider Daniel to be a legendary character ¹⁰⁷. Likewise, aside from the controversial attempts to deny David's existence, especially by the so-called minimalists ¹⁰⁸, there are some confusing episodes in the David cycle ¹⁰⁹. In this case, we have two narratives about Goliath's death with two different endings: in the first one, the best-known tale, David appears and kills the Philistine (1 Sam 17,50-51); in a less popular version, Elhanan ends the life of the giant of Gath (2 Sam 21,19). In order to explain this contradiction, the *Midrash* and *Targum* tradition suggests that Elhanan and David are the same person ¹¹⁰.

It is worth adding that David and Daniel represent the people of Israel, especially in their struggles against the enemies of the moment (Philistines, Babylonians and Greeks). Both pray before God on behalf of the people, asking for the fulfilment of the Lord's promises (2 Sam 7,18-29 and Dan 9,1-19). However, most importantly both characters display loyalty to God and a concern for fighting against idols. Daniel's loyalty is beyond question (chs. 1, 2, 3, 6, 9 and Bel and the Dragon), while David, despite having sinned against God, will also be remembered as a model for the people (1 Sam 13,14; 2 Sam 7,18-29; 2 Sam 5,21; 1 Kgs 15,5).

More specific coincidences between the two stories can be identified: the use of an analogous literary genre, the precise combination of dialogue and narration, a similar plot and storyline, a comparable structure centered in the hero (his wisdom and the consequences of his absence/presence), the use of irony ¹¹¹, a detailed description of the elements (the statue and Goliath's equipment), the fear or anguish provoked by the presence of the statue (Dan 2,31) or Goliath (1 Sam 17,11.24), the [promise of the] king's reward (1 Sam 17,25-27; Dan 2,47-49, cf. Dan 5,7.16) and, most importantly, a similar theological content, where issues such as idolatry and the kingdom of God are prominent.

The two passages manifest the triumph of God against the pride of the pagan kings and against what they represent, namely, idols. This is more evident in the story of Daniel 2 (and in general in the whole section of stories in Daniel), when the king confesses the true God after Daniel's wonderful action (Dan 2,47). In contrast, in 1 Samuel 17, Goliath's

¹⁰⁷ COLLINS, *Daniel* (1984), 28.

¹⁰⁸ See P.R. DAVIES, "'House of David' Built on Sand: The Sins of the Biblical Maximizers", *BAR* 20 (1994) 54-55.

¹⁰⁹ D.D. PIOSKE, "David", *EBR* 6 (2013) 189-193.

¹¹⁰ RUDMAN, "The Commissioning Stories", 526.

¹¹¹ On this point, see J.P. FOKKELMAN, *Reading Biblical Narrative* (Tools for Biblical Study Series 1; Leiden 1999) 29-35.

recognition of David's God is given only implicitly: first with the defeat of the Philistines (vv. 51-53) and then with Goliath falling "on his face to the ground" (וַיִּפֹּל עַל-פְּנֵי אֶרֶצָה, v. 49). This expression, as has been seen, can denote submission and homage, but also worship.

In addition, the kingdom of God is present in both tales. In Daniel this is one of the main topics ¹¹², and, while not so explicit, it emerges also, in some way, in the David and Goliath scene. We actually find expressions related to God's dominion over all kings, such as the recognition formula (1 Sam 17,46) or some others like "YHWH Sabaoth" (1 Sam 17,45) or "for YHWH is lord of the battle" (1 Sam 17,47). Moreover, the earlier mention of the kingdom wrested from Saul (1 Sam 15,28) underlines the idea that it is God who gives the kingdom to whom He will, an argument that connects with Daniel (Dan 2,21.36-45; 4,29.31).

Other similarities concern the stone and its meaning. The most obvious is that, in both passages, the victory is due to a stone (אֶבֶן) bringing down a giant (Dan 2,34-35; 1 Sam 17,49-50). By such an action, the enemy who threatens the people falls defeated, while the victorious one progresses and grows stronger as a kingdom (Dan 2,35,48; 1 Sam 17,50; 18,5). In both cases, the stone stands for God, who provokes the ruin of the great and mighty (the kings/empires in Daniel; Goliath and the Philistines in 1 Samuel) and gives the victory to the little ones (the kingdom of God, symbolized in a small stone that becomes a great mountain that fills the earth; and the shepherd David, who becomes a king who fills the history of Israel). In David's story this meaning of the stone is clearly not as explicit as in Daniel 2. On the contrary, David's personal skill seems to be emphasized. However, as we will see below, David knows that all his victories are due to God (1 Sam 17,45-46; 2 Sam 5,10.17-20; 8,14), even when the future king will use his abilities to win (2 Sam 5,8; 8,1-14). In fact, as usually happens in the Bible, God does not exclude the active intervention of his chosen servant (e.g., Joshua), as the latter uses his personal skills, craftiness, military strategies and so on, to win a battle (Jos 8,1-9; 10,9). However, the victory is always attributed to God (Jos 10,8), who caused more enemies to die from the great stones that rained down from heaven than those killed by the swords of the Israelites (Jos 10,10-11).

The similarity between the two stories would be even greater if one were to accept the opinion of A. Deem, who, based on ancient texts, archaeological and linguistic arguments, has suggested that the stone did not

¹¹² SEOW, "The Rule of God in the Book of Daniel", 219; J.E. GOLDINGAY, *Daniel* (WBC 30; Nashville, TN 1989) 330.

strike the giant's forehead, because his helmet would have protected him (1 Sam 17,5). Further, Goliath should have fallen backwards instead of face forward. Deem argues that the stone would "'sink' into the greave", in the gap between knee armor and leg (1 Sam 17,6) ¹¹³. The giant would have then fallen face forward, and, due to his own weight and his heavy armor, would not have been able to get up easily. Taking advantage of that situation, David would have advanced upon him, removed Goliath's sword and cut off his head. In Deem's words — her interesting hypothesis has increasingly been accepted ¹¹⁴ — "the 'Achilles' heel' was Goliath's knee" ¹¹⁵. While falling forward and not backwards, Goliath, as Dagon, the god of Philistines (1 Sam 5,3), and even as Nebuchadnezzar (Dan 2,46), "unwittingly comes into the praying position for the God of Israel" ¹¹⁶.

Finally, differences in the way the stone is driven must not be overlooked. In Daniel the stone appears in a mysterious way. According to v. 34, its origin is not known, although we learn later that it is detached from a mountain (v. 45). However, it is emphasized that there is no intervention of human hands (2,34.45; cf. 8,25). Consequently, it is implied that the stone was moved by means of a direct action of God. By contrast, David uses his "human" hand to throw the stone with a sling (1 Sam 17,49).

Despite this obvious difference, some connections can also be established. For one, the stone and the bearer of the stone descend from a mountain (Dan 2,45 and 1 Sam 17,3). Likewise, the figure the stone will strike appears wrapped in different metals (Dan 2,32-33 and 1 Sam 17,4-7) and is given an ambiguous characterization. In Daniel 2-3, it is not specified whether the statue corresponds to a man or an animal. Similarly, Goliath does not appear to be human either. He is described — in clear contrast with David (1 Sam 16,12 and 17,42) — as a sort of superhuman being (a kind of iron/bronze man), likened to one of the wild beasts (bears or lions) that David was used to killing (1 Sam 17,36). Finally, David is convinced to fight in the name of the Lord of hosts (1 Sam 17,45). He trusts God to deliver Goliath into his hands (vv. 37, 46). In sum, it

¹¹³ She interprets *אֶל-מִצְחֹו* and *בְּמִצְחֹו* (v. 49) according to *מִצְחֹת* (v. 6), as a greave. A. DEEM, "[...] and the Stone Sank into His Forehead'. A Note on 1 Samuel XVII 49", VT 28 (1978) 349-351.

¹¹⁴ FOKKELMAN, *The Crossing Fates*, 185-186; G.T.K. WONG, "Goliath's Death and the Testament of Judah", *Bib* 91 (2010) 425-428; VERRET, *The Serpent in Samuel*, 53-58.

¹¹⁵ DEEM, "And the Stone", 351.

¹¹⁶ FOKKELMAN, *The Crossing Fates*, 186.

can be said that “the hand of God”, an expression that has been gaining importance in the previous chapters (1 Sam 4,8; 5,12; 6,3.5; 7,13; 12,15), acts in a mysterious way through David’s hand, the hand of his beloved servant (1 Sam 16,13.18; 18,12).

Lastly, both texts can be connected by their salvific/messianic dimension. In fact, if the two stories are read in parallel and in light of Antiochus IV’s religious persecution, they coincide in theological perspective. Accordingly, in the image of the stone broken away with no human intervention, one can glimpse the attitude of trust in God’s saving intervention, in other words, a passive expectation, which is a typical view of the apocalyptic movement. On the other hand, the story of David’s victory seems to exemplify, at first glance, a more combative mentality, which could correspond to the supporters of the Maccabean revolt. However, as in 1 Macc 3,17-24, it is also possible to find an attitude of complete confidence in the victory of the Lord, as expressed in 1 Sam 17,45-47, where, in my opinion, the theological key to the story is to be found.

IV. DAVID AND DANIEL: BEYOND INTERTEXTUALITY

The fight between David and Goliath has become paradigmatic of an unequal struggle between someone strong and powerful and someone small and lacking resources. This precise argument, related to the theme of idolatry, is echoed in various parts of the book of Daniel. Having noted the close relationship between these two specific tales (1 Samuel 17 and Daniel 2), I would like to propose, at the end of this paper, a special connection between the scene of David and Goliath, understood in a broad sense, and the book of Daniel as a whole. This extended relationship of a narrative in a book, which goes beyond intertextuality, has recently been called *internarrativity* ¹¹⁷.

It is not my intention to define, or even systematize in a few words, this relatively new concept ¹¹⁸. While intertextuality — itself a slippery concept ¹¹⁹ — is used to designate the relationships that a text may have with other texts, internarrativity would concern broader relationships,

¹¹⁷ W.G. SHIN, “Internarrativity and *ecce homo*: A Masterplot Underlying Zechariah 6.9-15 and 1 Samuel 9.1 – 11.15 and its Function in John 19.1-16”, *JSNT* 43 (2020) 194-213; J. HUDDLESTON, “What Would Elijah and Elisha Do? Internarrativity in Luke’s Story of Jesus”, *Journal of Theological Interpretation* 5 (2011) 265-282.

¹¹⁸ There is no entry for the word “internarrativity” yet in the 4th edition of C. BALDRICK, *Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms* (Oxford 2015).

¹¹⁹ See G. ALLEN, *Intertextuality* (London 2000); F. MILÁN, “Biblia e intertextualidad: una aproximación”, *Scripta Theologica* 48 (2016) 357-379.

namely between narratives. In a sense, internarrativity is closer in meaning to interdiscursivity than to intertextuality ¹²⁰.

Internarrativity has been understood “as a specific form of intertextual relations” ¹²¹, as a type of allusion ¹²² or, more specifically, as “discursive processes through which narratives implicitly or explicitly refer to, invoke and are empowered by other narratives” ¹²³. It applies when there are allusions that refer not only to a written source (“source text”) but evoke stories that after being told many times and in different ways, survive in the memory of ancient readers (the exodus from Egypt, for example) ¹²⁴. Consequently, “the chief source is not a specific textual rendering but a set of narrative elements such as characters, actions, and themes” ¹²⁵. The aim, therefore, is to send “interpreters back, not to the source text, but to the source *story*” ¹²⁶. In a sense, this source story functions like the *Ur-story*, such that future narratives will work with the pattern, scheme, motif or genre from that story ¹²⁷.

The story of David and Goliath fits well into this category. Indeed, it is a story told many times, whose narrative properties (plot, characters, themes) are especially present in the book of Daniel. Subsequently, similar to the role of intertext in intertextuality, the tale of David’s victory would constitute for Daniel’s stories the “internarrative” or the “source narrative”. This is not to say that David’s tale is the only source for the Book of Daniel, but is a *significant narrative source* (among other sources), that has influenced most parts of the Book of Daniel.

One of these narrative elements repeated in the tales of Daniel is the presence of the spirit of the Lord. Just as David is invaded by the רוח-יהוה (1 Sam 16,13) and manages with his music to free the king from the evil *spirit* that is tormenting him (רוח-רעה, 1 Sam 16,14), similarly Daniel, in whom the *spirit* of the holy god resides (רוח-אלהין קדישין, Dan 4,5.6.15;

¹²⁰ See J. WU, “Understanding Interdiscursivity: A Pragmatic Model”, *Journal of Cambridge Studies* 6 (2011) 95-115.

¹²¹ SHIN, “Internarrativity and *ecce homo*”, 196.

¹²² HUDDLESTON, “What Would Elijah”, 265-282.

¹²³ L. HAGSTRÖM – K. GUSTAFSSON, “Narrative Power: How Storytelling Shapes East Asian International Politics”, *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 32 (2019) 387-406, here 388.

¹²⁴ HUDDLESTON, “What Would Elijah”, 265-267.

¹²⁵ HUDDLESTON, “What Would Elijah”, 266.

¹²⁶ HUDDLESTON, “What Would Elijah”, 267.

¹²⁷ C. MORARU, “Intertextuality”, *Routledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory* (eds. D. HERMAN – M. JAN – M.-L. RYAN) (London 2005) 256-261. Moraru uses “Ur-text” in the analogy. I prefer to employ “Ur-story” because of the non-textual character of the internarrativity.

5,11.12.14), will manage to calm the *spirit* of the kings Nebuchadnezzar and Balthasar, when they are troubled by their dreams and visions (2,1; 4,2.16; 5,6).

Another element of David's story that has great repercussions in the book of Daniel is confidence in God, who saves his loyal servants from bears, lions and giants (1 Sam 17,34-37.45-47; Dan 2,44.46; 6,17.21.24.28; Bel 1,38 LXX/Th). In Daniel (7,4-5), the bear and the lion also symbolize an enemy threat to the people of Israel (1 Sam 17,36 and Dan 7,17). Similarly, the lions that appear in Daniel 6 and in the deuterocanonical story of Bel and the Dragon represent the danger that looms over righteous Daniel.

However, internarrativity between the corpora is best appreciated in relation to plot, where a strong character (generally huge, famous, arrogant, self-confident, etc.) falls down before a weak one (small, unknown, humble, confident in God, etc.): an imposing statue is reduced to powder by a forgotten stone (Daniel 2); four extraordinary beasts collapse before the mysterious Son of Man and the people of the saints of the Most High (Daniel 7); two abusive old men fall before the young Daniel, who is defending the cause of Susanna (Susanna); and the powerful idol of Bel is burst by the action of the defenseless Daniel (Bel and the Dragon). This last episode repeats, furthermore, some patterns of the combat between David and Goliath: there is a *huge* idol (v. 23 Th); Daniel *asks permission* from the king to kill it (vv. 25-26 LXX/Th); he fights against it without using *sword or club* (v. 25 Th; v. 26 LXX); he defeats it by *throwing* (v. 27: ἐνέβαλεν according to LXX; ἔδωκεν according to Theodotion) something that makes it burst (v. 27 LXX/Th). As a consequence, Daniel will be *persecuted and punished* by the king (vv. 28-30 LXX/Th). To these stories could be added the tales of chs. 1, 3, 5 and 6, where the victory of the helpless (Daniel and the three young men) against the powerful (the king or his servants) is also forthcoming.

In the end, this study leads to the conclusion that similarities between David and Daniel are not purely coincidental. The literary analysis of 1 Samuel 17 and Daniel 2 has proven that the links between the passages are deeper than appear at first sight. For this reason, a relationship of *internarrativity* — a broader concept than intertextuality in the sense that internarrativity considers stories not just texts — is proposed. The influence of David's story on Daniel is so deep that it acts at different levels and covers multiple aspects, be they narrative, theological, or related to the nature of the characters. In fact, it is no coincidence that, as the change

of era advances, both figures are gaining in importance and messianic functions, as is attested in later Jewish writings, in Qumran and in the earliest Christian literature ¹²⁸.

Departamento de Estudios Bíblicos
e Historia de la Iglesia
Facultad de Teología
Campus Universitario
31009 Pamplona

Fernando MILÁN

SUMMARY

This study compares the scene in which a stone overthrows the statue in Nebuchadnezzar's dream (Daniel 2) with the narrative of the battle between David and Goliath (1 Samuel 17). From different perspectives, both stories promote absolute trust in a God who saves his servants. Furthermore, the battle between David and Goliath has become a paradigm for uphill battles by those who are weak and ill-equipped against those who are strong and powerful. This struggle reverberates through various parts of the book of Daniel and relates to the theme of idolatry. Hence, a more extensive connection is proposed between the David and Goliath scene and the book of Daniel as a whole. This relationship falls under the category of *internarrativity*.

¹²⁸ See P.W. FLINT, "David. III. Judaism", *EBR* 6 (2013) 196-200; COLLINS, *Daniel*, 72-89, 112-123; A.Y. COLLINS, "The Influence of Daniel on the New Testament", in COLLINS, *Daniel* (1993) 90-112.

HISTORICAL (IN)ACCURACY AND LINGUISTIC ARCHAISM IN DANIEL 5 *

INTRODUCTION

The fifth chapter of the book of Daniel contains the famous story of the writing on the wall. Nebuchadnezzar's son Belshazzar, the last king of Babylon, sins by using the vessels from the Jerusalem Temple at his feast and by blessing all the idols, but not the true God. A supernatural hand writes an illegible message on the wall (according to the Masoretic Text [MT]: מִנָּא מִנָּא תְּקֵל וּפְרָסִין), which the Judahite exile Daniel reads and interprets as predicting the fall of the Neo-Babylonian Empire to the Medes and Persians. Despite the gloomy forecast, Daniel receives his promised reward of luxurious clothing and a high position, and the prediction is fulfilled that very night.

While this story is clearly legendary, scholars have also identified some concrete historical inaccuracies¹. Two important ones focus on the character of King Belshazzar, son of Nebuchadnezzar. Historically, Belshazzar (Akkadian: Bēl-šarra-ušur) was not the son or descendant of Nebuchadnezzar (Nabû-kudurri-ušur), but of Nabonidus (Nabû-nā'id). Nor was he ever king, although he did reign as vice-regent in his father's absence from the city². Given this entrustment of the kingship (*šarrûtu*) to Belshazzar, as recorded in the *Verse Account of Nabonidus*³, the use of the Aramaic word מֶלֶךְ (commonly: “king”) may not be completely inappropriate⁴. But the fact remains that Nebuchadnezzar was not historically Belshazzar's father or ancestor, making the use of the words בֶּרֶךְ “son, descendant” and אָב “father, ancestor” inaccurate. An author writing soon after Belshazzar's time would be unlikely to make such a mistake. Hence, the

* The research for this paper was funded in part by a Research Foundation — Flanders (FWO) Senior Postdoctoral Fellowship, project number 1231920N. I sincerely thank the participants in an Academia.edu session for their comments on an earlier draft of this essay, especially Harald Samuel, Maarten Kossmann, David Ross, and B. Blasebalg, as well as the anonymous reviewer of this paper.

¹ C.A. NEWSOM, *Daniel*. A Commentary (OTL; Louisville, KY 2014) 163-164.

² J.J. COLLINS, *Daniel*. A Commentary on the Book of Daniel (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN 1993) 32-33.

³ COLLINS, *Daniel*, 32.

⁴ P.R. DAVIES, *Daniel* (OTG 4; Sheffield 1993) 30-31. The comparison is often made to the use of מֶלֶךְ in the Tell Fekheriye inscription (KAI 309) for a person who is referred to as a governor in the matching Akkadian version.

presence of Nebuchadnezzar in this story has been taken as evidence for its composition some considerable time after its setting in the sixth century BCE ⁵.

In this article, we will consider whether this evidence for a relatively late dating also holds for Daniel 5*, the hypothetically reconstructible earliest version of this text. Nebuchadnezzar is explicitly mentioned or implicitly referred to in three contexts in the chapter. Based on comparison to the different edition of Daniel 5 preserved in the Old Greek translation (OG) and on internal, literary evidence, I will argue that all of these mentions are secondary to the text ⁶. Additionally, a number of remarkably archaic linguistic features occur in one passage of Daniel 5 in particular. Taken together, this text-critical, literary, and linguistic evidence suggests that the story of the writing on the wall not only preserves traditions from the Neo-Babylonian period but may have been written down soon afterwards.

I. MENTIONS OF NEBUCHADNEZZAR IN DANIEL 5

Nebuchadnezzar features prominently in the first one-third of Daniel as the arrogant and often-incensed king of Babylon, sometimes with reference to his role in the destruction of Jerusalem (Dan 1,1-2; see also

⁵ COLLINS, *Daniel*, 33.

⁶ OG Daniel is only directly attested in two manuscripts: the pre-Hexaplaric Papyrus 967, dated to the third century CE, and in the Hexaplaric, tenth-century Codex Chisianus, referred to as '88'. It can also be reconstructed based on the close Syriac translation of the Syro-Hexapla. These sources form the basis of the critical edition employed for this article: O. MUNNICH (ed.), *Susanna. Daniel. Bel et Draco* (Septuaginta 16; Göttingen ^{2a}1999). The appropriateness of treating MT and OG of Daniel 5 as different versions of the same text has recently been questioned by I. YOUNG, "The Original Problem. The Old Greek and the Masoretic Text of Daniel 5", *Empirical Models Challenging Biblical Criticism* (eds. R.F. PERSON JR. – R. REZETKO) (Ancient Israel and Its Literature 25; Atlanta, GA 2016) 271-301. Based on the many differences between these texts, Young argues that they do not reflect a single written archetype, but are different textualizations of related oral traditions. Contrast the approach that does assume a textual relationship, adopted, for instance, by E. ULRICH, "The Parallel Editions of the Old Greek and Masoretic Text of Daniel 5", *A Teacher for All Generations. Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam* (ed. E.F. MASON) (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 153; Leiden – Boston, MA 2012) 201-217; M. SEGAL, "Daniel 5 in Aramaic and Greek and the Textual History of Daniel 4–6", *Congress Volume Stellenbosch 2016* (eds. L.C. JONKER – G.R. KOTZÉ – C.M. MAIER) (Leiden 2017) 251-284. Following especially Segal, I too believe that the differences between MT and OG are surmountable; many examples of variation between MT and OG highlighted by Young are similar to cases documented in manuscript transmission of what is unquestionably the same text. The presence in both texts of many shared expressions, which are often immaterial to the plot, strongly points towards transmission in a more or less fixed textual form.

the secondary mention of this fact in OG Dan 4,19)⁷. Within Daniel 5, he is identified as Belshazzar's father by the character David in his recapitulation of the events of Daniel 4, by the queen, and by Belshazzar himself, as well as in the mentions of the Temple vessels which he brought from Jerusalem.

1. *Daniel's recapitulation (5,18-22)*

When Daniel is called in to read the writing, both MT and OG have him begin by chastising Belshazzar for his sins. The MT's version of this speech includes a summary of earlier events affecting Nebuchadnezzar, which Belshazzar should have taken to heart:

You, O king — the Highest God gave your father Nebuchadnezzar the kingdom and greatness and glory and splendor. And due to the greatness that he gave him, all peoples, nations, and tongues trembled before him and feared him. He would kill whomever he wished and he would keep whomever he wished alive and he would exalt whomever he wished and he would humble whomever he wished. But when his mind grew exalted and his spirit grew exceedingly arrogant, he was brought down from his royal throne and the glory was removed from him. And he was driven away from human beings and his mind was made equal to that of animals, and his dwelling was with the wild donkeys. They fed him grass like cattle and his body was washed by the dew of heaven, until he learned that the Highest God reigns over the kingdom of mankind and he can establish whomever he wants over it. But you, his son Belshazzar, did not humble your mind, even though you know all this⁸. (MT Dan 5,18-22)

This passage establishes continuity with the preceding chapter and holds up Nebuchadnezzar, who had to learn about God's power the hard way, as an example to his son Belshazzar. In OG, however, this passage is completely absent. As most recently argued by Michael Segal⁹, there is no apparent reason why OG should have eliminated it, while the reasons for its insertion in MT are clear; it is most likely a secondary addition.

2. *"your/my father the king" (5,11.13)*

Two more mentions of Nebuchadnezzar occur in MT in 5,11 and 5,13. The first one is shared in other words with OG (where it occurs in v. 12).

⁷ On the mention in Daniel 4, see M. SEGAL, *Dreams, Riddles, and Visions*. Textual, Contextual, and Intertextual Approaches to the Book of Daniel (BZAW 455; Berlin 2016) 117-118.

⁸ All translations of the MT are mine.

⁹ SEGAL, "Daniel 5", 255-256.

The second does not occur there explicitly, although reference is made to the Judahite exile in OG v. 10, possibly implicitly alluding to Nebuchadnezzar's role in that event. Below the quotes from the MT, I have included a translation of OG 5,10-12 for comparison.

There is a man in your kingdom in whom there is a spirit of holy gods, and in the days of your father, illumination and understanding and wisdom like wisdom of the gods was found in him. And your father King Nebuchadnezzar, your father the king established him as the chief of [various kinds of mantic experts]. (MT Dan 5,11)

The king spoke, saying to Daniel: "You must be Daniel, who is of the exiles of Judah, whom my father the king exiled from Judah". (MT Dan 5,13b)

Then the queen reminded him concerning Daniel who was among the captives of Judea. And she said to the king, "That person was prudent and wise and surpassed all the sages of Babylon, and a holy spirit is in him. And in the days of your father the king he explained difficult meanings to Nabouchodonosor your father ¹⁰". (OG Dan 5,10-12)

In MT v. 11, the subject is mentioned twice: once at the beginning of the sentence, as מלכא נבכדנצר אבך "your father King Nebuchadnezzar", and once at the end, as אבך מלכא "your father the king". It is likely that of these two subjects, the more specific one was added later, presumably to more explicitly identify Belshazzar's father as Nebuchadnezzar.

Nebuchadnezzar is not explicitly named in MT v. 13, but he is implicitly referred to, as he was the Babylonian king responsible for the Judahite exile. The repetition here is less jarring than that in v. 11. Still, "whom my father the king exiled from Judah" reads as an afterthought and serves no purpose in the context other than once again asserting that Belshazzar is the son of Nebuchadnezzar. Moreover, we are most likely dealing with an interpolation here as well. As the whole passage of MT vv. 13b-16a has no direct OG parallel, it is tentatively identified as secondary by Segal on other grounds ¹¹.

3. *The desecration of the Temple vessels (5,2-3.23)*

This leaves us with the first and last mentions of Nebuchadnezzar, in connection with the vessels from the Jerusalem Temple. These are shared by both MT and OG. Nebuchadnezzar is explicitly mentioned in 5,2-3, while his involvement is implied by the mention of the Temple vessels in 5,23.

¹⁰ Translations of OG are from NETS.

¹¹ SEGAL, "Daniel 5", 256-257.

Under influence of the wine, Belshazzar ordered that the golden and silver vessels that his father Nebuchadnezzar had taken from the palace that was in Jerusalem be brought in so that the king and his nobles, his concubines and his consorts could drink from them. Then they brought the golden vessels that they had taken from the palace of the house of God that was in Jerusalem, and the king and his nobles, his concubines and his consorts drank from them. (MT Dan 5,2-3)

And you exalted yourself against the Lord of Heaven and they brought the vessels of his house before you and you and your nobles, your concubines and your consorts were drinking wine from them, and you praised the gods of gold and silver, bronze, iron, wood, and stone, who do not see and do not hear and know nothing, but you did not glorify the god who holds your breath in his hand and whose are all your ways. (MT Dan 5,23)

As Daniel's narration in v. 23 makes clear, Belshazzar has committed two sins. Not only did he abuse the vessels from the Temple, but he also neglected to praise God while praising idols instead (originally narrated in v. 4)¹². It is remarkable that divine punishment, which is decreed immediately following the second sin (MT v. 5: **בה שעתה** "at that moment"), appears to be lacking after the first sin is committed. Moreover, the sin of sacrilegious use of the Temple vessels seems more specifically tailored to a Jewish audience than the sin of omission of the one god who should be praised if any are to be praised at all. It seems more likely that a more universally recognizable sin would be supplemented with one with special relevance to the target audience than vice versa. If we agree that the double sin is unnecessarily redundant, then the use of the Temple vessels is more likely to be secondary¹³. Such a later addition would reflect the trend of ascribing increasing importance to the Temple vessels and their preservation as a symbol of continuity with the First Temple Period after the Babylonian Exile¹⁴.

¹² Cf. L.M. WILLS, *The Jew in the Court of the Foreign King*. Ancient Jewish Court Legends (HDR 26; Minneapolis, MN 1990) 122-123; NEWSOM, *Daniel*, 162.

¹³ The redundancy of the first sin is confirmed by its absence from the short summary of the story included at the beginning of the OG account, known as the Preface or OG Dan 5,0. Pace D. AMARA, "The Third Version of the Story of Belshazzar's Banquet (Daniel 5) [Hebrew]", *Textus* 23 (2007), and J.L. PANNUK, "The Preface to Old Greek Daniel 5: A Formal Approach", *VT* 67 (2017) 213-226, the Preface is probably dependent on the other attested versions of Daniel 5, however, so it does not reflect a stage of the text before this sin was added; cf. SEGAL, "Daniel 5". Pannuk argues against Segal that ancient scribes would not have misread MT v. 1 as implying the presence of two thousand guests, as stated in the Preface, but cf. the similar, overly literal reading of Zech 9,9: "riding on a donkey, (and) on an ass, the son of she-asses" in Matt 21,2-7, where the poetic repetition of חמור and ער is reinterpreted as referring to two separate animals.

¹⁴ P.R. ACKROYD, "The Temple Vessels — A Continuity Theme", *Studies in the Religion of Ancient Israel* (VTSup 23; Leiden 1972) 166-181.

There are further indications that the use of the Temple vessels was added secondarily. Segal identifies the “concubines and consorts”, which are lacking from OG, as a secondary feature of MT ¹⁵. Especially without this phrase, vv. 3-4 read very repetitively:

Then they brought the golden vessels that they had taken from the palace of the house of God that was in Jerusalem, and the king and his nobles, ~~his concubines and his consorts~~ drank from them. They drank wine and praised the gods of gold and silver, bronze, iron, wood, and stone. (MT Dan 5,3-4)

The same verb אשתיו “they drank” is used twice in rapid succession for no apparent reason. This repetition becomes understandable if vv. 2-3 were secondarily inserted. In MT v. 1, the number “one thousand” lacks a parallel in OG; Segal once again identifies this as an expansion in MT ¹⁶. The rest of v. 1b, “and ~~before the one thousand~~ he was drinking wine”, most likely forms part of the same interpolation as vv. 2-3, as it explains how Belshazzar came to be intoxicated enough to order the Temple vessels to be brought to him. Excluding all of these elements leaves us with a smooth transition from v. 1a to v. 4:

King Belshazzar prepared a great feast for his nobles [...] They drank wine and praised the gods of gold and silver, bronze, iron, wood, and stone. (MT Dan 5,1a.4, minus אלה “one thousand”)

In v. 23, on the other hand, there is no indication that the mention of the Temple vessels is secondary compared to its direct context. It is likely, however, that the entire recapitulation of vv. 23-24 is secondary. In MT, it is somewhat intrusive, as it stands between Daniel’s statement that “I will read the writing for the king and make known to him the interpretation” (v. 17) and the actual reading and interpretation in vv. 25-28. In OG, the interruption is even worse, as the writing is already read in v. 17 (assuming that ἡρίθμηται κατελογίσθη ἐξῆρται “it has been numbered; it has been reckoned; it has been taken away” translates the mysterious words themselves, מנא תקל פרס) followed by the announcement that “this is their interpretation”, with the interpretation not being given until vv. 26-28. OG v. 26 once again states that “this is the meaning of the writing”, which looks like a resumptive repetition (*Wiederaufnahme*) of v. 17. MT has lessened the back-and-forth by moving the reading of the writing to v. 25, but the more awkward order of OG is probably more original. This resumptive repetition strongly suggests that vv. 23-24 were secondarily inserted to spell out what Belshazzar did wrong. Restoring a more

¹⁵ SEGAL, “Daniel 5”, 257-260.

¹⁶ SEGAL, “Daniel 5”, 258.

original form of the text where v. 17 was immediately followed by v. 25 (since vv. 18-22 were already argued to be secondary) leaves us with a Belshazzar story that does not mention or allude to Nebuchadnezzar anywhere, removing the main historical argument against its early composition.

II. ARCHAIC LANGUAGE IN DANIEL 5

Without the historically inaccurate depiction of Belshazzar as Nebuchadnezzar's son, a major obstacle for the early dating of Daniel 5 is removed. Evidence pointing towards a relatively early date of composition for the core narrative comes from several linguistic features occurring in vv. 10-12, where "the queen" (Aramaic: מלכתא), generally taken to be Belshazzar's mother or even grandmother¹⁷, tells Belshazzar about Daniel and suggests he be called to read the writing on the wall. We will examine three such features.

As is shown especially by the phenomenon of *ketiv-qere* discrepancies, the reading tradition underlying the Masoretic vocalization is secondary as a whole to the Biblical Aramaic consonantal texts. Linguistically, the dialect of the reading tradition finds its closest parallels in Aramaic varieties of the late first century CE¹⁸, some two centuries after the latest texts in Daniel were composed. Since the features we will consider are archaic even within the consonantal text itself, it is no wonder that they were unfamiliar to the people who fixed the reading tradition. In two cases, we will see that the reading reflected by the Masoretic vocalization is probably not the one that was originally intended, while this is also possible, if less probable, in the case of the remaining archaic feature.

1. יתקרי "let him be called" (5,12)

The queen's speech concludes with the words "now, let Daniel be called (יתקרי) and he will tell the interpretation" (v. 12b). The Masoretic Text vocalizes the verb "let him be called" as an imperfect, reflecting a reconstructed form **yitqarē*¹⁹. Here, **-ē* is the normal ending for III-weak

¹⁷ COLLINS, *Daniel*, 248.

¹⁸ B.D. SUCHARD, "The Origins of the Biblical Aramaic Reading Tradition", VT 71 (2021) 105-119.

¹⁹ For the reconstruction of the Biblical Aramaic reading tradition used in this section, see B.D. SUCHARD, "Sound Changes in the (Pre-)Masoretic Reading Tradition and

imperfects. But a complication arises when we take Biblical Aramaic consonantal orthography into account. Elsewhere, word-final **-ē* is exclusively spelled with ה or א; this holds for verbs, e.g. תִּהְיֶה and תִּהְיֶה **tihwē* “it (f.) will be”, as well as adjectives and nouns, e.g. גָּלָא and גָּלָה **gālē* “revealing (m.sg.)”; כְּרִסָּא **kursē* “throne”; אַרְיָה **ʔaryē* “lion”. An apparent counterexample occurs in the construct state masculine plural ending, which is spelled with י, but historically this was **-ay*, as still in Syriac, not **-ē*, e.g. בְּנֵי **banay* “sons of”. The spelling יתְקַרִי for **yitqarē* is thus unexpected, as this would appear to be the only case of **-ē* spelled with י in all of the Biblical Aramaic corpus.

III-weak prefix conjugation forms ending in י do regularly occur in Imperial Aramaic. Here, we find a contrast between imperfects spelled with final ה and jussives spelled with final י: a minimal pair occurs in יהוה **yihwē* “he will be” vs. יהי **yihwī* “let him be”²⁰. Given the context, Dan 5,12’s יתְקַרִי must also originally have been intended as a morphologically distinct jussive, **yitqarī* “let him be called”²¹. In later Aramaic, this form was lost, and the regular imperfect was used with this meaning, e.g. Dan 2,20 להוּא **lihwe* “let it (m.) be”, Ezra 5,15 יתבנא **yitbanē* “let it (m.) be built”. Accordingly, the readers vocalized יתְקַרִי as **yitqarē*, drawing on later Aramaic spelling practices where word-final *-ē* could be expressed by י. While negated jussives occur both in this passage (אל יבהלך “let them not terrify you”, אל ישתנו “let them not change”, both in v. 10) and elsewhere (אל יבהלך “let it not terrify you”, Dan 4,19), this is the only positive, morphologically contrastive jussive attested in Daniel or Ezra (but cf. יאבדו “let them be lost”, Jer 10,11)²². The verb יהחור at the end of v. 12 is spelled with a final ה, ostensibly contradicting the suggestion that the spelling with final י marks a morphologically distinct jussive²³. In context, however, this verb may better be interpreted not as another jussive but as an imperfect with final modality: “(Now let Daniel be called) in order to explain (the meaning)”. This matches the fact

the Original Pronunciation of Biblical Aramaic”, *Studia Orientalia Electronica* 7 (2019) 52-65.

²⁰ T. MURAOKA – B. PORTEN, *A Grammar of Egyptian Aramaic* (HdO 32; Leiden ²2003) § 37d.

²¹ Cf. F. ROSENTHAL, *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic* (PLO 5; Wiesbaden ⁷2006) §§ 108, 152. S. SEGERT, *Altaramäische Grammatik* (Leipzig 1975) § 5.7.8.4.2, writes that such a jussive is not attested in Biblical Aramaic, implicitly rejecting the possibility that יתְקַרִי should be identified as such.

²² Cf. ROSENTHAL, *Biblical Aramaic*, § 108.

²³ Jussives with final ה do occasionally occur in the Proverbs of Ahiqar (TADAE C1.1). These are analyzed as inconsistencies by MURAOKA – PORTEN, *Egyptian Aramaic*, 137 n. 693, but they are considered as distinct forms of III-w verbs by I. KOTTISIEPER, *Die Sprache der Ahiqarsprüche* (BZAW 194; Berlin 1990).

that in our narrative, “let him be called” is a direct order, given to those present, while **“let him explain” is not. Recognizing a morphological distinction between jussive and imperfect in this verse thus enhances our understanding of its meaning.

2. ואמרת “saying” (5,10)

A very frequent collocation introducing direct speech in Daniel is **ענה ואמר**, often with the subject intervening, as in **ענה מלכא ואמר** “the king spoke, saying [...]”. The spelling of the masculine singular form of this expression is ambiguous with regards to tense. Despite the past-tense reference, the Masoretic vocalization takes both verbal forms as participles: **עֲנֶה** *ʕānē “answering (m.sg.)” and **אָמַר** *ʔamar “saying (m.sg.)”. Both forms could also be vocalized as perfects, however: *ʕanā “he answered” and *ʔamar “he said” would have the same consonantal spelling.

Where unambiguously spelled forms occur, the tendency is to use a perfect for the first verb: masculine plural **ענו** *ʕanaw (Dan 2,7.10; 3,9.16; 6,13) and, in our passage, feminine singular **ענת** *ʕanāt (Dan 5,10). An unambiguous participle only occurs once as **עֲנִיךָ** *ʕānayn in Dan 3,24, in an exchange that is absent from OG, adds nothing to the story, and is therefore probably a late interpolation in MT. It is unlikely that the language would use the perfect for this construction in the plural but a participle in the singular. The construction thus originally employed a perfect for the first verb; the ambiguous form **ענה** represents the perfect *ʕanā, although it entered the reading tradition as a participle *ʕānē, reflecting the same reinterpretation of this construction seen in the interpolated form in Dan 3,24.

For the second verb, on the other hand, the unambiguous forms nearly all point to a participle. In the masculine plural, we find **ואמרין** *wa-ʔamarīn in every case (Dan 2,7.10; 3,9.16.24; 6,13). As the translation “saying” suggests, we can understand a participle in this context as expressing a circumstance. The construction is then similar to Classical Arabic *ḥāl* clauses like (ǧāʔa) *rākiban* “(he came) riding”, where *ǧāʔa* is a perfect and *rākiban* is a participle in the accusative²⁴. Only in our passage do we find what appears to be a perfect: **ואמרת** *wa-ʔamarát.

The same expression **ענת ואמרת** occurs in the Sheikh Fadl inscription (TADAE D23.1.II:10), dated paleographically to the first half of the fifth century BCE but set in the seventh century and possibly originally

²⁴ W. FISCHER, *Grammatik des klassischen Arabisch* (PLO 11; Wiesbaden 1972) § 380.

composed at that time ²⁵. As in Daniel 5, both verbs appear to be perfects. This is confirmed by multiple unambiguous forms in the Proverbs of Ahiqar (TADAE C1.1), where we find עִנִּית וְאָמַרְתָּ “I spoke, saying” (l. 45, with a masculine subject) and וְאָמְרוּ [...] עֲנִי “they spoke, saying” (l. 169; only וְאָמְרוּ attested in l. 58). These attestations occur both in the narrative framework, written in Imperial Aramaic, and in the proverbs themselves, which reflect an older dialect characterized by Gzella as “late Old Aramaic” ²⁶. Comparing these attestations to those in the Biblical Aramaic corpus, there seems to have been a diachronic development of perfect + perfect (Proverbs of Ahiqar, Sheikh Fadl and Dan 5,10) → perfect + participle (Biblical Aramaic consonantal text in most places) → participle + participle (Dan 3,24 and Biblical Aramaic reading tradition, where possible). Dan 5,10 thus patterns with the older, possibly even pre-Imperial Aramaic phase of the language, against the rest of the Biblical Aramaic corpus.

3. מִפְשֵׁר “*interpreting*”, אַחֲרִית “*solving*”, מִשְׂרָא “*untying*” (5,12)

The queen’s praise of Daniel in v. 12 includes three phrases consisting of a bare infinitive, i.e. one that is not preceded by ל “to” or another preposition, and its complement:

Since an exceptional spirit and knowledge and understanding, interpreting (מִפְשֵׁר) dreams and solving (אַחֲרִית) riddles and untying (מִשְׂרָא) knots was present in this Daniel [...] (MT Dan 5,12aα)

The use of an infinitive without a preposition is exceptional in Biblical Aramaic and does not occur elsewhere ²⁷. When this statement of the queen is repeated by Belshazzar in v. 16, which may be from a later hand as mentioned above, it is paraphrased to avoid the construction with the bare infinitive:

And I have heard about you that you are able to provide (לְמִפְשֵׁר) interpretations and to untie (לְמִשְׂרָא) knots. (MT Dan 5,16a)

That the reading tradition was also uncomfortable with bare infinitives is clear from the vocalization of the G-stem (*pe‘al*) infinitives as מִפְשֵׁר and

²⁵ T.L. HOLM, “The Sheikh Fadl Inscription in Its Literary and Historical Context”, *AraSt* 5 (2007) 193-224, here 201.

²⁶ KOTTSEPER, *Ahiqarsprüche*; H. GZELLA, *A Cultural History of Aramaic*. From the Beginnings to the Advent of Islam (HdO 111; Leiden 2015) 151.

²⁷ H. BAUER – P. LEANDER, *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen* (Halle an der Saale 1927) §§ 261. Contrast the use of the preposition ל in a syntactically similar position in Ezra 4,14: “and it is not fitting for us to see (לְמַחֲזֹא) the dishonor of the king”.

מְשָׂרָא, as if they were D-stem (*pa'el*) participles, even though this is nonsensical in the context²⁸. Only the C-stem (*aph'el*) infinitive אֶחְיִית was vocalized correctly, since no alternative was available²⁹.

In Imperial Aramaic, the infinitive is also commonly preceded by ל. As the only examples of a bare infinitive used as the subject of a clause, Muraoka – Porten cite two phrases from the Proverbs of Ahiqar: “for it is not in the hands of men to lift their foot (מְנַשָּׂא רַגְלָהֶם) and put them down (וּמְנַחֲתוּתָהֶם) [...] for it is not in your hands to lift your foot (מְנַשָּׂא רַגְלְךָ) to put it down (*n.b.* לְמַנְחֲתוּתָהּ)”³⁰. It thus appears to be limited to the older language of the proverbs proper. The use of this construction in Dan 5,12 can therefore rightly be called archaic.

CONCLUSION

We have examined two issues that bear on the dating of Daniel 5. As we have seen, the mentions of Nebuchadnezzar can all be seen as secondary, while the passage featuring the queen contains a number of remarkably archaic linguistic features. In the conclusion of this paper, let us consider a few other relevant issues.

On the literary side of things, the core narrative of Daniel 5* is not only free of historical inaccuracies³¹, but also contains several details that match its historical setting quite well. The presence of the queen-mother as an important figure at the court may reflect the influential role played

²⁸ ROSENTHAL, *Biblical Aramaic*, § 111, hesitantly considers that these may be “further infinitive formations of the derived conjugations”. These would then be formally unparalleled elsewhere in Aramaic. An anonymous reviewer of this article suggests that the vocalization may be related to the shift of G-stem to D-stem verbs that may be observed in post-Biblical Hebrew. Note, however, that the arguably later infinitives in v. 16 are unproblematically vocalized as G-stems.

²⁹ Strictly speaking, the *aph'el* (C-stem with an א or zero in the prefix) is less archaic than the *haph'el* (C-stem with ה in the prefix), as remarked by an anonymous reviewer. Both forms already occur in late Old Aramaic and in Imperial Aramaic, however. In Imperial Aramaic, “a given verb is spelled in the same tense and by the same scribe indiscriminately with an Alef or a He”; MURAOKA – PORTEN, *Egyptian Aramaic*, § 28. Hence, the technically innovative use of א is not out of place among the archaisms in this passage. The vocalization of the infinitive ending in construct as -at against expected -ūt is striking, but not obviously archaic or innovative, unless it is in response to the archaic defective spelling of *ʔahwāyūt as אַחַיִּית, a possibility suggested by the reviewer.

³⁰ MURAOKA – PORTEN, *Egyptian Aramaic*, § 56i.

³¹ The closing verse describing Belshazzar’s death and the fall of the Babylonian Empire probably does not match the historical events. Following certain scholars, however, I would identify this as a redactional insertion; see E. HAAG, *Die Errettung Daniels aus der Löwengrube*. Untersuchungen zum Ursprung der biblischen Danieltradition (SBS 110; Stuttgart 1983) 34.

by Nabonidus' mother Adda-guppi³². Besides purple clothing and a golden necklace, Daniel's reward consists of authority **תלתא במלכות**, a phrase which probably should be translated as "as the third in the kingdom"³³. Three is a common number in legends, but *a priori* we might expect Daniel to be made viceroy, second only to the king himself like Joseph in Egypt (Gen 41,41-44). But the position of third-in-command makes sense in the historical context, with the absent Nabonidus retaining the kingship, Belshazzar ruling as his vice-regent, and Daniel — so the story tells us — in third place as Belshazzar's direct subordinate. Finally, there is the figure of Belshazzar himself, who did not make a lasting impression in other sources; that Daniel 5 knows of him at all points to some historically accurate knowledge of the sixth century, whether this was passed down in writing or orally³⁴.

Linguistically, the use of archaic features dating to Imperial Aramaic and even earlier dialects is striking. It would be an exaggeration to say that the core narrative of Daniel 5 presents itself in a purely Imperial Aramaic form. As in the rest of the Biblical Aramaic corpus, a number of Imperial Aramaic spelling conventions have been abandoned, such as the spelling of **d* (originally **ḏ*) in certain words with 𐤌 (Biblical Aramaic: 𐤌) and the mostly defective spelling of the masculine plural absolute state ending 𐤌- (Biblical Aramaic virtually always plene, 𐤌-). An interesting feature is the spelling of three radicals in the word **עללת** "she entered" (Dan 5,10). This contrasts both with later Aramaic, cf. the *qere* form **עֲלַלַת** **ʕallat*, and with the attested Imperial Aramaic masculine plural form **עֲלִיל** **ʕallū*. It also contrasts with Dan 6,19 **נִדְתָּ** "it (f.) fled", showing that this is not simply the regular form in Biblical Aramaic. Since no relevant forms are attested in Old Aramaic³⁵, **עללת** could be another pre-Imperial Aramaic archaism (cf. Biblical Hebrew **סבב** "he turned"), but this is obviously an argument from silence.

³² COLLINS, *Daniel*, 248.

³³ V. 7 reads **תלתי** instead of **תלתא**, which further complicates our understanding of this not completely transparent word. As I hope to argue elsewhere, however, the passage featuring the mantic experts in vv. 7-9 is another likely example of secondary interpolation, which explains this inconsistency. The word **תלתא** itself should perhaps be seen as an adverb "thirdly", combining the base form of the numeral **talāt* "three" with the adverbial ending *-ā also seen in **כלא** **kull-ā* "entirely", **יתירא** **yattīr-ā* "exceedingly", and other words; see A.M. BUTTS, "An Aramaic Cognate to Akkadian -iṣ, Hebrew -כ, and Ugaritic -h", "Like 'Ilu Are You Wise". *Studies in Northwest Semitic Languages and Literatures in Honor of Dennis G. Pardee* (eds. H.H. HARDY II – J. LAM – E.D. REYMOND) (Chicago, IL forthcoming).

³⁴ See COLLINS, *Daniel*, 33.

³⁵ SEGERT, *Altaramäische Grammatik*, 284.

The two topics of historical accuracy and linguistic archaism meet in the question why it is precisely in vv. 10-12 that we find a clustering of special features. I see three possible solutions. Least excitingly, this may simply be a coincidence; the core narrative of Daniel 5* is not very long, and other archaisms may be lacking by chance. Second, we could think of a source-critical solution. The passage involving the queen is much shorter and phrased differently in OG, which might indicate that some or all of it is interpolated; another indication in this direction is the slight inconsistency between the verbs for “to change” used in v. 6 (שנו*, G-stem/*pe’al*) and v. 10 (ישתנו, tD-stem/*etpa’al*). Perhaps this interpolator had a penchant for archaism or reused an older text fragment. In that case, of course, the archaic language does not bear on the age of Daniel 5* in its oldest form. But if we do prefer to see vv. 10-12 as belonging to the oldest layer of Daniel 5*, a third option is that the writer purposefully used archaisms here for literary effect, highlighting the queen’s age compared to Belshazzar. This would provide linguistic support for the common opinion that the queen is not Belshazzar’s wife, but his father’s wife, widow, or mother, and further solidify the connection with the historical figure of Adda-guppi. The archaisms then do not directly reflect the language as it was normally used in the author’s day, although they must still have been known at that time — something that was no longer the case for all of these features when the Biblical Aramaic reading tradition was fixed.

Linguistic dating of biblical texts remains a perilous endeavor ³⁶, as does dating them based on limited historical data. We should be hesitant to categorically state that Daniel 5* was composed soon after the fall of the Neo-Babylonian Empire. In the absence of clear indicators of lateness, however, the preservation of accurate historical data and linguistic features from the sixth century make this an attractive point of departure for the dating of Daniel 5*.

Leiden University/KU Leuven
The Netherlands/Belgium

Benjamin D. SUCHARD

³⁶ See, e.g., the important contributions to the ongoing debate made by I. YOUNG – R. REZETKO – M. EHRENSVÄRD, *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts* (London 2008); C. MILLER-NAUDÉ – Z. ZEVIT (eds.), *Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew* (LSAWS 8; Winona Lake, IN 2012); R.S. HENDEL – J. JOOSTEN, *How Old is the Hebrew Bible? A Linguistic, Textual, and Historical Study* (AYBRL; New Haven, CT 2018).

SUMMARY

Daniel 5 contains a number of historical inaccuracies, most glaringly the identification of Nebuchadnezzar as Belshazzar's father. This article argues that all mentions of Nebuchadnezzar in Daniel 5 may be secondary, suggesting that the oldest version of the text could have been written soon after the Neo-Babylonian period. The queen's speech in vv. 10-12 contains a number of archaic linguistic features which may support such an early dating. These are the use of a morphologically distinct jussive, the use of two perfects in the expression "she spoke, saying", and the use of infinitives without a preceding preposition.

MARK'S "LEGAL SYSTEM": CONTRIBUTIONS FROM THE ANTHROPOLOGY OF LAW

I. INTRODUCTION

Mark narrates many controversies over legal matters, but does he operate out of any sort of "legal system" ¹? Does he know and endorse a body of laws? We suggest that he works out of a framework which accepts as the central and only Law the commandments written in Exodus and Deuteronomy, namely, the Ten Commandments. Hence, for Mark the *foundation* and *basic source* of Law is the collection of Ten Commandments. Their *authority*, moreover, rests on what God wrote and gave directly to Moses. This body of Law, moreover, is *found* in a source known to all, the Scriptures, which implies a "history" of the origins of the Law (creation, pre-Moses, Moses, post-Moses). Moreover, it was *published* and so *known*. As we shall see, this collection of Laws is the source of what was prohibited and permitted in the Markan narratives of controversies. Much more, however, can be said about Mark's "legal system".

For clarity's sake, we might briefly compare Mark with systems reflected in both Matthew and John. Matthew's system ² is partly similar to that of Mark, for he acknowledges the validity and importance of the Ten Commandments (5,21-37; 10,17-19; 15,4). But Matthew is also concerned with "laws" in another sense. He is attentive to the completeness of keeping

¹ The topic of "law" in Mark has been addressed in many different ways. A model of scholarship on this topic may be found in J. LAMBRECHT, "Jesus and the Law. An Investigation of Mk 7,1-23", *ETL* 53 (1977) 24-82. The present article adopts a different approach to the topic and asks new and different questions especially about Mark's "legal system". The goal is to discover what Mark understands by the term "law", what discrete items he examines, and whether he has a larger understanding of a "legal system".

² The vast literature on Matthew and the Law may be accessed in many places; see, e.g., R. BANKS, "Matthew's Understanding of the Law: Authenticity and Interpretation in Matthew 5,1-20", *JBL* 93 (1974) 226-243; É. CUVILLIER, "Torah Observance and Radicalization in the First Gospel. Matthew and First-Century Judaism: A Contribution to the Debate", *NTS* 55 (2009) 144-159; C.A. EVANS, *Matthew* (Cambridge 2012). There is general agreement that Matt 5,17-20 is "the most important part of the Sermon on the Mount" (EVANS, *Matthew*, 113) or that it is "of fundamental importance for understanding Jesus' attitude to the Law" (BANKS, "Matthew's Understanding of the Law", 226). But after canvassing the literature on the topic of "law" in Matthew, one sees that most scholars are imprecise about the meanings of "law", simply considering it to be "the Law of Moses", which might include the Bible or at least "the Law and the Prophets". It is unclear if they imagine a legal "system" in Matthew that distinguishes God's written Law from commandments of Moses or "law" from halakhic customs added by later teachers of the Law.

laws; he censures the person who “relaxes” (λύσῃ) one of the least commandments and teaches others to do so, but praises the person who “does and teaches” even those “least” laws (5,17-19). He cites Jesus’ extension of prohibition about three Laws, “kill”, “adultery”, and “false oaths”, and so approves of making a fence around Torah. Matthew, moreover, distinguishes between “heavy” and “light” burdens accompanying certain rulings (23,4), illustrated by reference to tithing herbs, which ignores “the weightier things of the law, (just) judgment, mercy and faith(fulness)” (23,23). It remains for scholars to look very closely to see if and what sort of “system” is operative in Matthew.

John’s Gospel, however, has been shown to focus on the Ten Commandments, in that Jesus is himself accused of violating many, and he in turn accuses his accusers of the same kind of violations ³. In regard to the Sabbath law, John records diverse rulings which permitted some exceptions or which restricted “work” (7,18.22-24); John narrates accusations against Jesus for healing on the Sabbath (5,10; 9,13-17.30-33) ⁴. Jesus’ opponents, however, also dismiss following of a “law”: “Does our law judge a man without first giving him a hearing and learning what he does?” (7,51), a “law” repeated in the trial where Jesus is accused *in absentia* (11,47-51). Contrary to this, Jesus’ enemies tell Pilate that it is “unlawful” for them to kill someone: “It is not lawful (οὐκ ἔξεστιν) for us to put anyone to death” (18,31), a Roman, not an Israelite law. John’s legal system focuses exclusively on the Ten Commandments, especially centered on the complex of rulings permitting and prohibiting “work” on the sabbath.

Excursus: Jesus the Teacher ⁵

In Mark’s narrative, Jesus is often seen “teaching” in a synagogue. He is, moreover, addressed as “Teacher” (διδάσκαλε) and “Rabbi” (ῥαββί). What, however, does he teach? Apart from two collections of materials (4,1-34; 13,1-36), his teaching is centered around “legal” matters. First, in an extended series of question-and-answer challenges, those credited with knowing the Law either accuse Jesus of “unlawful” behavior or ask legal questions about his actions. Jesus teaches both relaxation of certain “laws” and makes others stricter, and so they should all be considered legal “rulings”. When a man asked Jesus what he must do (τὶ ποιήσω) to inherit eternal life, Jesus

³ J.H. NEYREY, “The ‘Ten’ Commandments in the Gospel of John”, *Biblica* 102 (2021) 248-269.

⁴ See N.L. COLLINS, *Jesus and the Sabbath and the Jewish Debate*. Healing on the Sabbath in the 1st and 2nd Centuries CE (LNTS 474; London 2014).

⁵ Although published some time ago, the study by V.K. ROBBINS (*Jesus the Teacher*. A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of Mark [Philadelphia, PA 1984] esp. 64-68) remains a remarkable source of information about “teaching” in antiquity and in Mark.

enumerated six of the Commandments (10,19). Often, Jesus teaches actions for discipleship, either by introducing the matter with a conditional note (ἐάν, 8,34; 9,43-47; 10,12) or by directing a rule to "whoever" would or wishes to do something (ὅς γὰρ ἐάν, 8,35; 9,42; 10,11-12). Mark twice records a controversy over what "Moses said" versus what Jesus said (10,3-4; 12,19), both having to do with legal issues. Thus, Mark constantly presents Jesus as a teacher of "legal" matters, but not as a trained νομοδιδάσκαλος (Luke 5,17; cf. John 7,15). His authority to teach does not come from study under a recognized rabbi.

Turning back to Mark, we should examine more closely the technical language he employs when talking about "legal" controversies. First of all, we notice a pattern throughout Mark which distinguishes prohibition vs. permission, a distinction made regularly in the ancient world ⁶. The most evident legal terminology in Mark consists of these: 1) "unlawful" vs. "lawful"; 2) "clean" vs. "common"; 3) "law" vs. "tradition"; 4) "keeping" vs. "rejecting" (laws and traditions); and 5) Mark's distinctive understanding of "law" (ἐντολή). But these are not five different items, for one cannot study "unlawful" without examining what Mark means by his comprehensive term, "law" (ἐντολή). And knowing Mark's contrast between "law" vs. "tradition" involves knowing what "keeping

⁶ In Mark, the extensive pattern contains the following contrasts:

Prohibited	Permitted
"Who can forgive sins, but God alone?" (2,67)	"That you may know that the Son of Man has authority on earth to forgive sins" (2,10-12)
"Why does he eat with tax collectors and sinners?" (2,15-16)	"Those who are well have no need of a physician, but those who are sick" (2,17)
"Why are they doing what is not lawful on the Sabbath?" (2,24)	"Have you never read what David did [...] The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath" (2,25-27)
"Is it lawful on the Sabbath to do good or to do harm, to save life or to kill?" (3,4)	"Is it lawful on the Sabbath to do good or to do harm, to save life or to kill?" (3,4)
"Why do your disciples not 'walk' according to the tradition of the elders, but eat with hands defiled?" (7,5)	"You have a fine way of rejecting the commandment of God, in order to keep your tradition" (7,9)
"From the beginning of creation 'God made them male and female [...] what God has joined together, let no man put asunder'" (10,5-9)	"Is it lawful for a man to divorce his wife? [...] Moses allowed a man to write a certificate of divorce" (10,2,4)
"Is it lawful to pay taxes to Caesar or not? Should we pay them, or should we not?" (12,14-15)	"Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's" (12,17)
"Whose wife will she be?" (12,18-23)	"[...] they neither marry nor are given in marriage" (12,25)

and rejecting” mean. We need, then, to examine each aspect of this legal terminology operative in Mark’s narrative, although we should also ask whether the pieces when put together constitute a “system”. Nevertheless, the extensive controversies in Mark are over legal matters.

II. LEGAL TERMINOLOGY

1. “Unlawful” (οὐκ ἔξεστιν) vs. “Lawful” (ἐξεστιν)

Mark’s narrative is filled with “controversies”, which have been profitably examined in terms of literary patterns ⁷, rhetorical purpose ⁸, as debate ⁹ and *chreiai* ¹⁰. But Mark also narrates an extensive series of conflicts over what is prohibited and permitted, certain of which are introduced by the formula “It is not lawful (οὐκ ἔξεστιν)” or “Is it lawful (ἐξεστιν)?”. Here, at least, we find a place to begin our examination of a legal system in Mark. First, he prefaces certain controversies with a claim that something is “unlawful” (οὐκ ἔξεστιν) and queries whether other things are “lawful” (ἐξεστιν).

οὐκ ἔξεστιν

Mark 2,24: “Why are they doing what is not lawful (οὐκ ἔξεστιν) on the sabbath”?

[Matt 12,2: “Your disciples are doing what is not lawful (οὐκ ἔξεστιν) to do on the Sabbath”]

[Luke 6,2: “Why are you doing what is not lawful (οὐκ ἔξεστιν) to do on the Sabbath?”]

[John 5,10: “It is the Sabbath. It is not lawful (οὐκ ἔξεστιν) to carry your pallet”]

⁷ J. DEWEY, “The Literary Structure of the Controversy Stories in Mark 2,1 – 3,6”, *JBL* 92 (1973) 394-401; A.J. HULTGREN, *Jesus and His Adversaries* (Minneapolis, MN 1979) 25-38, 52-64; R. PARROTT, “Conflict and Rhetoric in Mark 2,23-28”, *Semeia* 64 (1993) 117-137.

⁸ J.H. NEYREY, “Questions, Chreiai, and Challenges to Honor. The Interface of Rhetoric and Culture in Mark’s Gospel”, *CBQ* 60 (1998) 657-681; see also E. GOODY, *Questions and Politeness. Strategies in Social Interaction* (Cambridge 1978) 17-43; D. DAUBE, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism* (Peabody, MA 1956) 141-155, 219-220.

⁹ R.P. BOOTH, *Jesus and the Laws of Purity. Tradition History and Legal History in Mark* (JSNT Supp. Series 13; Sheffield 1986) 77-78.

¹⁰ G.A. KENNEDY, *Progymnasmata. Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric* (Atlanta, GA 2003); R. HOCK – E. O’NEILL, *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric* (Atlanta, GA 1986); M.C. PARSONS – M.W. MARTIN, *Ancient Rhetoric and the New Testament* (Waco, TX 2018); see also B.L. MACK – V.K. ROBBINS, *Patterns of Persuasion in the Gospels* (Sonoma, CA 1989).

Mark 6,18: "It is not lawful (οὐκ ἔξεστιν) for you to have your brother's wife".

[Matt 14,4: "It is not lawful (οὐκ ἔξεστιν) for your to have your brother's wife"] (cf. Luke 3,19)

[Matt 27,6: "It is not lawful (οὐκ ἔξεστιν) to put them into the treasury, since they are blood money"]

ἔξεστιν;

Mark 3,4 "Is it lawful (ἔξεστιν) on the Sabbath to do good or to do harm?"

[Matt 12,10: "Is it lawful (ἔξεστιν) to heal on the Sabbath"]

Mark 10,2: "Is it lawful (ἔξεστιν) for a man to divorce his wife?"

[Matt 19,3: "Is it lawful (ἔξεστιν) to divorce one's wife for any cause?"]

Mark 12,14: "Is it lawful (ἔξεστιν) to pay taxes to Caesar, or not?"

[Matt 22,17: "Is it lawful (ἔξεστιν) to pay taxes to Caesar, or not?"]

[Luke 20,22: "Is it lawful (ἔξεστιν) to pay tribute to Caesar, or not?"]

What does Mark mean by labeling things "unlawful" or "lawful" ¹¹? Where are these "laws" found and how were they publicized? Who, in fact, declared them to be "unlawful or lawful"? And what importance do they have in the life of Mark's audience? An immediate distinction should be made in regard to things "unlawful" and "lawful" with regard to Laws specifically written by God in the Ten Commandments and to other "laws" credited to Moses' extension of Torah.

οὐκ ἔξεστιν: written (by God) in the Ten Commandments

Sabbath Law (Mark 2,24; Exod 20,8-10; Deut 5,12-14), which was interpreted according to someone's ruling/definition of "work"

"Honor Your Father and Your Mother" (Mark 7,9-10; Exod 20,12; Deut 5,16), seemingly accepted by all, except in Mark 7,9

ἔξεστιν: in "the Law", but not found in the Ten Commandments

Marrying a Brother's Wife (Mark 6,17-18; Lev 18,16; 20,21)

Divorce Permitted (Mark 10,2; Deut 24,1-4), Moses permitted it, but Jesus argues that this violates God's original law (Mark 10,5-9; Gen 1,27; 2,24)

"Unlawful" and "lawful" obviously express some "law", but Mark never uses the word νόμος. Rather he consistently employs the word ἐντολή,

¹¹ Noteworthy is the accusation against Paul and Silas in Acts 16,22: "They advocate customs which it is not lawful (οὐκ ἔξεστιν) for us Romans to accept or practice"; see also Paul's comment to the Roman tribune in Acts 22,25: "Is it lawful (ἔξεστιν) for you to scourge a man who is a Roman citizen, and uncondemned?"

which we learn refers only to the Law written by God, i.e., the Ten Commandments ¹². How does Mark think about the labels “unlawful” and “lawful”? What importance have they in his legal system?

Mark knows what comprises both tablets of the Commandments. He reports Jesus citing the first tablet (ἐντολή πρώτη, 12,28-29), and immediately adding to it the second (12,31), thus recognizing both, albeit in compressed form. Previously Mark reported that Jesus himself itemized six of these Commandments (τὰς ἐντολάς) found in the second tablet (10,19). And he cites a specific example of an ἐντολή in 7,9, which demands “Honor your father and mother”. In short, then, Mark clearly proclaims the Ten Commandments and implies the abiding duty to obey them.

Mark, then, has a classification system of “unlawful” and “lawful” actions based on the Scriptures; they are quite explicit, publicized, and well known. And so, Mark instructs his audience about what “law” means and its relationship to “the word of God”. But this only covers controversial topics where an explicit Law is in play.

2. *Pure (washed) vs. Unclean (unwashed)*

In Mark, this labeling pertains only to “food”, broadly considered ¹³. The argument about what constitutes “clean” eating practices or the use of clean vessels is not based on the Ten Commandments or on any of Moses’ laws ¹⁴. And so, this represents a weaker classification than “unlawful [...] lawful”, at least in Mark’s eyes ¹⁵. In fact, this terminology

¹² Mark’s usage is wrinkled in the debate over divorce in 10,1-9, where ἐντολή refers to what Moses *permitted*, not to anything *written* in the Ten Words of God. Moses’ ruling is then juxtaposed to what God legislated in Gen 2,24, deflating Moses’ authority. There are other uses of ἐξεστίν which have no relationship to Israel’s Scripture.

¹³ By “food, broadly considered”, we refer to the summary statement of J. NEUSNER (*From Politics to Piety* [Englewood Cliffs, NJ 1973] 86): “The Houses’ rulings pertaining either immediately or ultimately to table-fellowship involve preparation of food, ritual purity relating directly to food or indirectly to the need to keep food ritually clean, and agricultural rules concerning the proper growing, tithing, and preparation of agricultural produce for table use. The agricultural laws relate to producing or preparing food for consumption, assuring either that tithes and offerings have been set aside as the law requires, or that conditions for the nurture of crops have conformed to biblical taboos. *Of the 341 individual Houses’ legal pericopae, no fewer than 229, approximately 67 per cent of the whole, directly or indirectly concern table-fellowship [...]* The Houses’ laws of ritual cleanness apply in the main to the ritual cleanness of foods, and of people, dishes, and implements involved in its preparation. Pharisaic laws regarding Sabbath and festivals, moreover, involve in large measure the preparation and preservation of food” (emphasis added).

¹⁴ In a chapter of his monograph, BOOTH (“The History of Purity in Eating”, in *Jesus and the Laws of Purity*, 155-187) records the inventive rulings that developed, but were not based on specific laws in Scripture.

¹⁵ Yet, see J.G. CROSSLEY, “Halakah and Mark 7.4 [...] and beds”, *JSNT* 25 (2003) 433-447; IDEM, “Halakah and Mark 7,3”, *NTS* 58 (2012) 57-68.

is used only in Mark in regard to washing of hands (and vessels), thus a narrowly considered issue. Because others have examined the dating of these controversies and argued their importance, we focus on how Mark's classification of "clean" vs. "unclean" pertains to Mark's understanding of a "legal system"¹⁶. First of all, the argument about what constitutes "clean" eating practice or vessels is *not* based on the Ten Commandments *nor* on any of Moses' laws, and so has no place in Mark's "system". Moreover, the historical development of this type of ruling suggests that it was late in appearing and not grouped as a topic that was already settled. As Mark labels them, such issues belong to the "tradition" of the elders, indicating that their source was neither God, nor Moses; they derive from sages and teachers progressively building a fence around Torah. Since they are of a different order than "unlawful [...] lawful", they are of lesser importance than commandments in Scripture ("You leave the commandment of God, and hold fast to the tradition of men", 7,8). It ultimately matters in considering Mark's "legal system" that all rulings pertaining to the topic of "foods" are simply dismissed by Jesus and find no place in Mark's system.

3. "Keeping" vs. "Rejecting" and Laws vs. Traditions

Like the other labels, these are contrasted: "keeping" (tradition, from men) vs. "rejecting" (Law, from God). Depending on one's legal stance, "keeping" may be good or bad, likewise "rejecting". When Jesus contrasts ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ with παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, he is clear about the source of each and so the relative weightiness of each, which concerns "legal" matters.

By chapter seven, Mark has settled on a certain terminology to label these controversies. He contrasts "the law (ἐντολή) of God" with "the traditions (παράδοσις) of the Pharisees, scribes, and elders". The contrast is expressed in three explicit statements which juxtapose "keep" vs. "reject".

Mark 7	You reject	You keep
v. 8	ἀφέντες τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ	κρατεῖτε τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων
v. 9	ἀθετεῖτε τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ	τὴν παράδοσιν ὑμῶν στήσητε
v. 13	ἀκυροῦντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ	τῇ παραδόσει ὑμῶν ἢ παρεδώκατε

We know what Mark means by ἐντολή, namely, the Ten Commandments, so our task is to be clear about how he understands tradition (παράδοσις).

¹⁶ For a social-science reading of "clean and unclean" in Mark, see J.H. NEYREY, "The Idea of Purity in Mark's Gospel", *Semeia* 35 (1986) 91-128.

Precisely here we learn much about Mark's "legal system". Because he identifies the Ten Commandments as the ἐντολὴ τοῦ θεοῦ, he acknowledges them as the core of a system, implying a "history" of these Laws, acknowledging their source and central significance. All other "laws" or traditions must be measured according to this (e.g., Qorban, 7,11-12). Mark, moreover, will go on to argue that an ἐντολή of Moses is void when it contradicts the Law of God; God made a Law at creation about marriage at the creation of humankind (Gen 1,27; 2,24), which is earlier than Moses' law that permits divorce. Thus, Mark articulates a criteria to judge the validity of later developments of "law". In addition to "Law" (the Ten Commandments), Mark acknowledges that "traditions" exist, but which are inventions of new rulings, pertaining mostly to "food", broadly understood. Because they conflict with God's Law (7,8), Mark denies them "legal" status. Certain pieces of a "legal system", then, are evident, but not their formal coherence into a system as found in ancient discussions of law, such as those found in Greek and Roman authors — but a system nonetheless. Again, it ultimately matters that Mark records Jesus as dismissing all such rulings ("traditions") pertaining to things "clean" vs. "unclean". These matters, then, are excluded from Mark's system.

4. *Mark's Focus: Three Controversial Legal Topics*

Mark narrates a number of controversies which would seem to center around a specific ruling concerning actions not related in any way to the Torah or the Scriptures. The rulings that concern things prohibited and/or permitted seem to be implied in the criticisms of Jesus' behavior, such that Mark expects his audience to recognize them.

eating with tax collectors and sinners (2,16-17)
 not fasting (but *eating*, 2,18-22)
 plucking grain to *eat* (2,24-28)
 washing hands before *eating* (7,1-5)
 [all foods may be *eaten* (7,14-19)]

If the Scriptures give "unlawful" and "lawful" their importance, the same cannot be said for these, which are by no means "written" laws, nor are they stated formally in the Scriptures ¹⁷. Mark does not indicate that he

¹⁷ BOOTH (*Jesus and the Laws of Purity*, 274) uses "law" in an uncomfortably broad sense, including "custom", "traditional", "common usage", and "written"; although he is also interested in "legal history", he is not interested in a system; moreover, in one place he introduces terms from anthropology to clarify certain matters concerning "law" (pp. 146-147), but does not employ them to express a system.

knows the practice of building a fence around Torah ¹⁸, although this is clear to both ancient and modern readers. Yet, Mark seems to assign fence building to "Scribes" and "Pharisees", as indicated by his careful noting of who challenges Jesus on these issues. We focus on these because of their distinctive formulation and because they concern controversial topics in Pharisaic debate: Sabbath, food (from sowing to preparing) and marriage partners ¹⁹. We argue that these represent controversies over specific rulings, which pit those who would *prohibit* certain things against Jesus, Mark, and his audience, who in turn resist and argue for *permission*, not *prohibition*.

A comprehensive study of "lawful" and ἐντολή should pay close attention to the three classes of things declared "unlawful" and "lawful", which have long been accepted as a summary of many rabbinic controversies. While the "Law" may be known, controversy over what is prohibited or permitted in regard to these three topics goes back to the time of Paul (who may well have inherited these controversies), is found in all the Gospels, and extends to later writings.

The following outline demonstrates that similar controversies were occurring in other early Christian communities, indicating how important and widespread these issues were, and how hard it was to make a clear and firm ruling.

Sabbath

1. Controversy (Mark 2,23 – 3,3; Matt 12,1-14; Luke 6,1-11; and John 5,9-16; 7,21-23; 9,16.25).
2. Rare concern, because followers of Jesus replaced Sabbath with "the first day of the week" (Mark 16,1; Luke 24,1; John 20,1; Matt 28,1).
3. "A sabbath day's journey" (Acts 1,12; cf. Rom 14,5-6).

Foods, broadly considered.

1. Foods classified as clean (permitted) ²⁰ vs. common (prohibited) (Mark 7,14-29; Matt 11,17-19); quarrelling over opinions about foods (Rom 14,2-4).

¹⁸ G.F. MOORE (*Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era* [Cambridge, MA 1927] 1.33) quotes the ruling: "The motto of the Men of the Great Synagogue in *Abot* 1,1 is: 'Be deliberate in giving judgment, and raise up many disciples, and make a barrier about the law'". See also J. JEREMIAS, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus* (London 1962) 266; J. DUNCAN – M. DERRETT, *Law in the New Testament* (Eugene, OR 1970) 57, 221, 380.

¹⁹ This cluster of topics was well known; J.G. CROSSLEY (*The New Testament and Jewish Law. A Guide for the Perplexed* [London 2010]) made this cluster the core chapters of his book, although he does not tell us why he came to focus on "Sabbath", "foods", and "divorce". See also G.F. MOORE, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era. The Age of Tannaim* (Peabody, MA 1997) 142-143.

²⁰ Add here the tithing of foods, which was a prerequisite for suitability to offer in the Temple; "tithing" is mentioned only in Matt 23,23 // Luke 11,42, suggesting that, by the time the Gospels were written, it was no longer an issue and could be ignored.

2. All foods clean (Mark 7,19); God declares all foods clean (Acts 10,15).
3. Days of fasting: not eating (prohibition) vs. eating (permission) (Mark 2,18-22; Matt 9,14-17; Luke 5,33-38) ²¹.
4. Likes eat with likes: prohibited eating with tax collectors and sinners (Mark 2,16; Matt 9,11; Luke 5,33).
5. Prescribed washing of hands before eating (Mark 7,1-4; Matt 15,2; Luke 11,37-38).
6. Ongoing controversy over eating meat sacrificed to idols: (a) both permitted and proscribed (1 Cor 8,1 – 11,33); (b) only proscribed (Acts 15,20; Rev 2,14,20).
7. Prohibited behavior at Eucharist (1 Cor 11,17-22.27-29).

Marriage Partners

1. Prohibited marriage: (a) “It is not lawful (ἐξέστιν) for a man to have his brother’s wife” (Mark 6,18); (b) implied prohibition: “a man is living with his father’s wife” (1 Cor 5,1).
2. “Permitted” marriage: brothers marrying a brother’s widow (Mark 12,18-27; Matt 22,15-22; Luke 20,20-26).
3. Divorce: “Is it lawful (ἐξέστιν) for a man to divorce his wife?” permitted by “Moses”; prohibited by Jesus (Mark 10,3-9; Matt 19,3-9; Luke 16,18). Paul repeats Jesus’ prohibition (1 Cor 7,12), but creates a permission (1 Cor 7,13-16).
4. Prohibited partners: prostitutes (πορνεία) (1 Cor 6,13-19; Acts 15,20 ²²; John 4,16-18).

As interesting as this is, we can only mention it and continue with our sketch of Mark’s legal system, which is our primary focus.

Depending on how we imagine Mark’s location and audience, we should ask how his system was understood. In a synagogue or in dialogue with the teachings of Israelite sages, the system would be understood in terms of Torah and *halakhah*, terms not found in Mark. Should we equate “Law” (the Ten Commandments) with *Torah* and “tradition” with *halakhah*? If, however, Mark’s audience is Greek-speaking Gentiles outside of Galilee and Judea, other terminology would be both imaginable and probable, namely, the nomenclature found in Hellenistic discussions of law and laws. How, then, would Mark’s Gentile audience understand the controversies in which his Jesus is engaged, all of which have to do with “law” in some form?

²¹ Included here should be the libelous contrast between John fasting (demon) and Jesus eating (glutton), found only in Q (Matt 11,18-19 = Luke 7,33-34).

²² The term used for prohibition is a synonym of ἐξέστιν: “Abstain (ἀπέχεσθαι) [...] from unchastity (πορνείας)”.

III. ANCIENT LEGAL THEORY FROM ARISTOTLE TO CICERO

When the ancients discussed "law", they generally proposed a history of the development of "laws" in general, whereas Mark provides only a freeze-frame photograph of the schema, not an attempt to present a full historical system. Nevertheless, from Aristotle to Cicero ²³, the ancients regularly label the items they considered in legal terms, namely, as "norms", "customs", and "laws" ²⁴. For example, Aristotle distinguished these three in his treatment of justice, remarking: "To righteousness it belongs to be ready [...] to preserve *ancestral customs and institutions, and the established laws* (τὰ πάτρια ἔθη καὶ τὰ νόμιμα καὶ τοὺς γεγραμμένους)" (*Virtues and Vices* 5.2, emphasis added) ²⁵. The author of a work closer to the time of Mark, *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, made a comparable distinction: "We shall be using the topics of justice if we say that [...] *the laws and customs of the state* ought especially to be preserved" (*Herr.* 3.3.4, emphasis added). Cicero similarly defined justice as:

[...] a habit of mind which gives every man his desert while preserving the common advantage. Its *first principles* proceed from *nature*, then *certain rules of conduct* become *customary* by reason of their advantage; later still both the principles that proceed from nature and those that had been approved by custom *received the support of religion and the fear of the law* (*Inv.* 2.53.160, emphasis added).

Thus "principles from nature" and "certain rules of conduct" arise in the kinship institution, but become laws when they are supported in the political institution, where codes of enforceable laws are formally promulgated. "From nature" suggests "norms" that human beings crafted in the process of learning to live together harmoniously. "Custom" and "law" appear later in time and for a more formal purpose. But let us look more closely at Cicero's discussion.

Customary law (*consuetudine ius*) is either a principle derived only in a slight degree from *nature* and has been fed and strengthened by usage or any of

²³ All ancient texts and translations are taken from the Loeb Classical Library, unless otherwise specified.

²⁴ Moreover, many of these discussions are found in ancient treatments of "justice", where duties to god(s), *polis*, and parents were considered. For an example of these distinctions, see M. GRIFFITH, "Public and Private in Early Greek Education", in Y. LEE TOO (ed.), *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity* (Leiden 2001) 63-64. This suggestive topic deserves further investigation.

²⁵ Although we are translating these three items in socio-historical terms not used by Aristotle, the result would be: 1) τὰ πάτρια ἔθη = habits, common practice; 2) τὰ νόμιμα = usages, customs; and 3) τοὺς γεγραμμένους = published, established (body of) laws.

the laws that we have mentioned before which proceed from nature but *which have been strengthened by custom*, or any principle which lapse of time and public approval have made the habit or usage of the community [...]. *Statute law (lege ius)* is what is contained in a *written document which is published for the people to observe* (Cicero, *Inv.* 2.53.162, emphasis added).

And so, “custom” refers to norms which over time are strengthened by usage and public approval. In contrast, “law” reflects the system of decrees ordained by the political institution and formalized in a written code (i.e., the Twelve Tablets). Cicero states that some behaviors are “natural”, derived from simple usage, which in time become formalized, that is, they become the *mos maiorum* ²⁶. These decisions depend on the judgments of knowledgeable people, and, when documented and published, must be obeyed ²⁷. Thus “norms” originate at a low level of social organization in the kinship institution, but in time become “customs”, that is, the habits or usage of a more developed social group. They may in time be published as “laws” to command obedience, all of this occurring in the political institution.

Obviously, there was no concern for exact terminology, and we are uncertain whether Aristotle and Cicero agree about the items in their discussions; after all, they wrote under the influence of very different governments. This invites us to introduce a conversation from the social sciences whose very task was the precise determination of terminology.

IV. CONTRIBUTIONS FROM THE ANTHROPOLOGY OF LAW

We are able to bring greater clarity to our study of ancient law from the contributions of modern anthropology that provide refined and commonly accepted meanings of our legal terms ²⁸. It took many years for social scientists to agree on basic meanings for “norm”, “custom”, and “law”, which are not always clear in Aristotle or Cicero.

²⁶ See K.J. HÖLKESKAMP, *Restructuring the Roman Republic*. An Ancient Political Culture and Modern Research (Princeton, NJ 2010) 18-19; J. KENTY, “Congenital Virtue: *Mos Maiorum* in Cicero’s Orations”, *CJ* 111 (2016) 429-462; and M. TRÖSTER, “Plutarch and *Mos Maiorum* in the Life of Aemilius Paulus”, *Ancient Society* 42 (2012) 219-254.

²⁷ For example, Cicero speaks about commanding and forbidding (*imperandi atque prohibendi*, 1.15.42; 2.4.8) and prohibitions and resolutions (*prohibessint [...] rogassint*, 3.3.9).

²⁸ See P. BOHANNAN, “The Differing Realms of the Law”, in D. BLACK – M. MILES KI (eds.), *The Social Organization of Law* (New York 1973) 306-317; M. FREEMAN – D. NAPIER (eds.), *Law and Anthropology* (Oxford 2009); D. Black, *The Behavior of Law* (New York 1976); F. PIRIE, *The Anthropology of Law* (Oxford 2013); M. GOODALE, *Anthropology and Law*. A Critical Introduction (New York 2017).

Norm refers to common social arrangements of pre-political peoples. Peasants agree with neighbors about land boundaries, how to enter into agreements about shared labor, lending, betrothal contracts, and the like. They know the conventional ways to raise sons. These norms are taught as part of the socialization²⁹ that occurs in the kinship institution and are based on accepted notions of reciprocity. They represent village "common sense" or "this is how we always do something".

Customs arise when "norms" are gathered into some pattern, become regularized, and acquire a degree of "ought". Customs regularize weights and measures and express the social significance of roles and statuses of *persons* (especially hereditary offices and gender expectations). Customs mean shared understandings of *time* (a calendar), relationship to *things* (ownership and usage), and behavior appropriate to either public or private *places*. All of this depends on someone with authority determining what to prohibit or permit. The logic shifts from "this is how we *always* do it" to "this is how we *should* do it". Thus, some form of enforcement begins to develop.

Law is best defined in contrast with "norm" and "custom". With qualification³⁰, Bohannan's definitions provide a convenient entrance into this topic³¹.

Law must be distinguished from *traditions* and fashions and more specifically, it must be differentiated from *norm* and from *custom*. A *norm* is a rule, more or less overt, which expresses aspects of relationships between human beings. *Custom* is a body of such norms that is actually followed in practice much of the time [...] *Law* is specifically created by agents of society in the context of the institutions that are legal in character [...] A fairly simple distinction can be made between law and custom. *Customs* are *norms or rules* about the ways in which people *must* behave if social institutions are to perform their tasks in society. Some customs are re-institutionalized at another level: they are restated for the more precise purposes of legal institutions. When this happens, therefore, *law* may be regarded as a custom that has been restated in order to make it amenable to the activities of the legal institutions (emphasis added)³².

²⁹ On socialization, see J.H. NEYREY, "'How Does This Man Have Learning, Since He Is Without Education' (John 7,15)", *BTB* 48 (2018) 85-96.

³⁰ See PIRIE, *The Anthropology of Law*, 131-157.

³¹ BOHANNAN, "The Differing Realms of the Law", 308-309.

³² See also, PIRIE, *The Anthropology of Law*, 131-157. S. HUMPHREY ("Law, Custom and Culture in Herodotus", *Arethusa* 20 [1987] 217) offers a clear distinction between "law" and "custom" based on her study of ancient authors: "The important distinction in early Greek legal thought is not the opposition between custom and written law, but the difference between accepted and established rules of conduct handed down in the past, whether written or not, and the formulation of new rules [...] Right at the end of the fifth century, they (the Athenians) reformulated the distinction between established, lasting

In the next section, we will examine the Markan controversies to learn whether the conflict occurred over “norms” or “customs”, or “laws”.

V. MARK’S LEGAL SYSTEM: “NORMS”, “CUSTOMS”, AND “LAW”

Can discussions of law, ancient and modern, provide readers of Mark with any additional insight into this Gospel? What justification is there for bringing these materials into conversation with Mark ³³? If we use terms such as “norm”, “custom”, and “law” in regard to all of the legal controversies we have observed, is anything new learned? Are the insights valuable and worth the trouble? This, then, is the wager for re-reading Mark from the formal perspective of reliable terminology.

Sabbath

The first legal controversy in Mark concerns the observance of the Sabbath. While we are uncertain how Mark and his audience understood the continuing validity of this Law ³⁴, in the house of Israel Sabbath rest

norms and current decisions in the opposition between *nomos* intended to be valid for the whole citizen body and for all time and *psēphismata* (decrees) limited either to certain categories of person or to a set period (though in practice, both terminology and practice continue to be fluid). A *nomos* has to go through a more complex legislative procedure, and its authority was superior to that of a decree. At the same time they ruled that courts were not to ‘use unwritten laws’”.

³³ While perhaps not intending to do so, BOOTH (*Jesus and the Laws of Purity*, 146-147) presented a model of the development of law comparable to that which is the focus of this article, although his model is based on English Common Law, not ancient or modern anthropological materials: “[It is thus possible to over-estimate the role of logic in legal development] since law arises from society, from the people themselves, and embraces all of the innumerable customs, habits and practices which form the life of a society or group of people [...] Customs include what is called the ‘ritual of the mores’ [...] The mores are the social ritual in which we all participate unconsciously. The current habits as to hours of labour, meal hours, family life, the social intercourse of the sexes, propriety, amusements, travel [...] Each does as everybody does”. Booth did not actually enter through this door, but he introduced a fresh way of examining legal matters in Mark. We itemize the elements he mentions: first, a “model”, the development of law; second, specific elements of this model, namely law, custom, and norm (which he describes as “habits and practices” or “mores”).

³⁴ COLLINS (*Jesus, the Sabbath and the Jewish Debate*, 208-216) argues that “popular” debate over the lawfulness of healing/doing good on the Sabbath was well developed even in the first century. “Popular” for her means removing the historical Pharisees from all such controversies. She accepts the transformation of Jesus into a respected “teacher”, indicating development in the Gospel communities. She concludes from her study of Jewish materials that there was already a relaxation of the meaning of “work” that included both healing and feeding the hungry on the Sabbath. This learned study, however, is not a study of the development of Mark’s audience, whether it should be located in synagogues in Galilee or in Gentile territory. Hence, she does not ask whether Sabbath observance was

"is one of the most distinctive aspects of Israel's faith" for three reasons: first, God rested from all the work done in creation (Gen 2,2); second, the Sabbath was a day to remember liberation from Egypt (Deut 5,14-15), and third, its observance recalled the Sinai covenant (Exod 31,12-17)" ³⁵. Although a law *written* by God, its *interpretation* was endlessly debated by mortals. The controversy over Sabbath observance in Mark 2,23-28 depicts "Pharisees" declaring a "custom", that is, an extension of the written Law: "'It is not lawful' for your disciples to do what they are doing". For discussion, we ask three questions: 1) what was "legal" about Sabbath observance; 2) what does Mark say about how Jesus kept Sabbath when he went to synagogue (i.e., what did he do?); and 3) was this an issue for Mark and his audience (or for the early church)?

Mark mentions that Jesus attends synagogue on the Sabbath (1,21; 3,1; 6,2), which obviously was not considered "work". If attendance was itself a "norm", something all village males did, it might be a custom-in-the-making, such that non-attendance was censurable. Mark, however, is not concerned with a possible obligation, but with what "work" was done then. In all three occurrences, Jesus performed an action, primarily "teaching", which included a "healing". The synagogue audience in 1,21-28 approves of Jesus' actions, thus permitting them ("they were amazed"), and they sent abroad a good reputation about him; they did not consider that he was violating any custom or law. In contrast, when Jesus later appears on the Sabbath in a synagogue and does the same things, he provokes a death plot.

His teaching was about a legal issue, Sabbath observance: "Is it lawful to do good or to do harm, to save life or to kill?" ³⁶. Thus, affirming "doing good" and "saving life", he healed. The rule makers, "Pharisees", both rejected his teaching and condemned his "work". In the eyes of the first crowd, Jesus did *not* violate a custom; rather, he seems to have followed a norm; in the eyes of the Pharisees, he violated a custom, which they considered an extension of the fence around the Sabbath

a current issue for Mark and his audience. And if she is correct that considerable relaxation was already being allowed, then all the more is this a moot issue for Mark. She does not comment on Sabbath observance in the early church, which was not part of her project. All of her data and discussions might well be used to argue for the non-significance of Sabbath observance in Mark's world.

³⁵ J.R. DONAHUE – D. HARRINGTON, *The Gospel of Mark* (Collegeville, MN 2002) 110-111.

³⁶ Mark does not include an appeal to a "norm" that appears elsewhere, which would make excellent common sense to many people: "Does not each of you on the Sabbath untie his ox or his ass from the manger, and lead it away to water it?" (Luke 13,15; cf. 14,5). Permission precluded prohibition.

rest law ³⁷. But in Mark, permission prevails over prohibition. Sabbath has no fences, suggesting that it has ceased to be a legal issue ³⁸. Inasmuch as we find no controversy in Paul or the early church over Sabbath observance, we might well ask if Sabbath was observed in Mark's communities. If not, it does not belong to his "legal system". Jesus, moreover, is the source of this ruling.

Fasting

When "John's disciples and the Pharisees" questioned Jesus about non-fasting, there does not seem to be a ruling, i.e., custom, concerning this ³⁹. Yet in Luke 18,9-14, it is said that Pharisees are said to fast twice a week, thus expressing an attempt to create a custom. Mark relates that Jesus rejects any custom regarding fasting (2,19), although he indicates that "the days will come [...] then they will fast on that day" (2,20). As regards a legal ruling, then, fasting remains non-regulated in Mark and apparently in the early church.

In addition to Mark, the Q document reports on slander against John and Jesus which is worth a brief note (Luke 7,31-35 // Matt 11,16-19).

John the Baptist came eating no bread and drinking no wine; and you say, "He has a demon". The Son of man has come eating and drinking; and you say, "Behold, a glutton and a drunkard, a friend of tax collectors and sinners" (Luke 7,33-34).

It is not necessary to argue any relationship between Mark 2,18 and Luke 7,31-24. What is important is that someone was trying to make a

³⁷ It should be noted how controversially "work" continued to be defined by the sages and rabbis, and so how hard it was to establish a custom. About this, J. NEUSNER (*The Mishnah. A New Translation* [New Haven, CT 1988] 187-188) commented: "The generative categories of acts of labor [prohibited on the Sabbath] are forty less one: (1) he who sews, (2) ploughs, (3) reaps, (4) binds sheaves, (5) threshes, (6) winnows, (7) selects [fit from unfit produce or crops], (8) grinds, (9) sifts, (10) kneads, (11) bakes, (12) shears wool, (13) washes it, (14) beats it, (15) dyes it, (16) spins, (17) weaves, (18) makes two loops, (19) weaves two threads, (20) separates two threads, (21) ties, (22) unties, (23) sews two stitches, (24) tears in order to sew two stitches, (25) traps a deer, (26) slaughters it, (27) flays it, (28) salts it, (29) cures it, (30) scrapes it, (31) cuts it up, (32) writes two letters, (33) erases two letters to write two letters, (34) builds, (35) tears down, (36) puts out a fire, (37) kindles a fire, (38) hits with a hammer, (39) transports an object from one domain to another".

³⁸ Although Pharisees judge the disciples to be violating the Sabbath by plucking grain, Jesus seems to bypass that issue by maintaining a norm that hunger trumps custom: "David was in need and was *hungry*" (Mark 2,25-26). For lack of interest in Sabbath observance in the early church, see the outline above on p. 235.

³⁹ For a more extended understanding of fasting, see B.J. MALINA, *Christian Origins and Cultural Anthropology* (Atlanta, GA 1986) 185-204, esp. 202.

pious practice (see Matt 6,16-18) into a custom. Jesus at first permits current non-fasting, but prohibits eating later. This, then, has an ambiguous place in Mark's system.

Washings (hands, cups, pots and vessels of bronze)

In Mark's time, there were no formal "laws" about washings, that is, there was no law (written or oral) which mandated such customs, such as the many prohibitions found in Mark 7,2-5⁴⁰. Moreover, what might be ruled appropriate for Temple worship by the elite priests in the urban capital may be of lesser importance in peasant villages in Galilee and especially in Mark's Gentile context⁴¹. It is one thing to wash "hands" and quite another to wash "cups and pots and vessels of bronze", which represents an extension of the fence around torah.

If the written law authorizes Sabbath rest, the authority behind *these* extensions does not rest on any law, but on "the tradition of the elders" (7,3.5). We classify the "tradition of the elders" urged here as an attempt to establish a "custom" that is in the process of being extended, i.e., a prohibition. Jesus resists this extension by accusing the Pharisees of over-extending their customs, putting them in direct conflict with "the *commandments of God*" (7,8), and so judges them to be "rejecting the *commandment of God* in order to keep your tradition" (7,9). In Mark's argument, the *commandment* of God overrides the *custom* urged by "Pharisees and

⁴⁰ See BOOTH, *Jesus and the Laws of the Purity*, 155-187, which remains a valuable study of the issue of washings in Mark 7. Booth's historical perspective considers both Jesus and Mark, thus allowing for historical development of these controversies, which Booth calls "Laws". However, Booth only *allows* for the possibility of Jesus knowing these materials, and argues that, on the basis of the on-going controversy reported in Acts 15, Mark *actually knew* them and reacted to them: "Mark's attitude to the law [laws of purity] appears as free as that of the Gentiles, except that, as a Jew, he is more conscious of the distinctions between the traditional law and the written law, and between contaminated foods, non-kosher food and prohibited food" (BOOTH, *Jesus and the Laws of Purity*, 220). Yet, all of his arguments might equally work against the continuing importance of purity "laws" in Mark's audience, inasmuch as all "traditions of the elders" are themselves dismissed in view of the "commandments" of God. Jesus' arguments must count for something in Mark, for Mark highlights them.

⁴¹ BOOTH (*Jesus and the Laws of Purity*, 155-158) makes the case that purity rules, while initially directed toward priests, became the concern of laymen also. He argues forcefully from the Hananiah decrees concerning the parallel but distinct implications concerning washing (*Jesus and the Laws of Purity*, 164-173) and foods (*Jesus and the Laws of Purity*, 173-178). J. MARCUS (*Mark 1-8* [New York 2009] 394-395) argued that in the background there is the Pharisaic concern for the proper bloodlines of the high priests, especially after the descendants of Zadok were chased from Jerusalem. Pharisaic concern for the purity of the Temple, its priests, and its operations included that of the correct genealogy of the high priesthood and the manner in which Hasmonians took it over — marriage partners.

Scribes”, thus promoting a permission and dismissing a prohibition. It would seem once more that Jesus’ total rejection of “the traditions of the elders” on this point suggests that these matters have no place in Mark’s legal system.

Food rules

When Jesus and his disciples talk apart from the crowd, he issues what seems like a custom or ruling concerning “foods”. He redefines what “clean” and “unclean” mean by reversing the conventional understanding: what goes *in* does not pollute, but only what comes *out*. And so, on the basis of this principle, “He declares all foods clean” (7,19), thus exempting his disciples from all envisioned rulings about foods (and washings). Because that conventional ruling was not based on Law (by God), but the traditions (by men), Jesus cancels all discussion about washings and foods from debate and controversy for his disciples; he says more, concluding that such have no place in his “system”. Thus, he favors permission over prohibition.

Qorban

Most commentary on Korban/Qorban has been concerned with its dating and meaning ⁴². More to our purpose are discussions of “oaths” and “vows” which call attention to what is forbidden and permitted ⁴³. Others have directed us to controversies in the Gospels over oaths, such as Matt 23,16-17 ⁴⁴; and so we examine the directives for what is vowed (permitted to some, but prohibited to others) in relation to the Temple and Pharisaic concern for it. The issue to be considered is whether this is a matter of concern for Mark’s Gentile world? And if what is “vowed” is dedicated to the Temple ⁴⁵, was the Temple still standing to make this relevant?

⁴² For example, D.E. NINEHAM (*The Gospel of St Mark* [New York 1968] 190) acknowledges the problem of this quest: “The difficulty here is to know precisely what custom in contemporary Judaism is being alluded to”. See J. MARCUS, *Mark 1–8*, 444-452; DAUBE (*The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, 63-67) offers a different way of reading material such as this in terms of “principle and cases” and “principle and example”; see also D.M. YOUNG – M. STRICKLAND, *The Rhetoric of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark* (Minneapolis, MN 2017) 185-212; CROSSLEY, *The New Testament and Jewish Law*, 26-44.

⁴³ M. WILCOX, “Corban”, *ABD* 1:1134.

⁴⁴ M.H. POPE, “Oaths”, *IDB* 3:575-577. E.P. SANDERS (*Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah* [London 1990] 51-57) discusses Korban in a section called “Oaths and Vows”.

⁴⁵ On the relationship of Korban to the Jerusalem cultus, see H.H. GUTHRIE, “Corban”, *IDB* 1:681, who mentions that it is the legal basis for dedication of offerings. Mark later

Honoring parents

In terms of a "legal system, Mark promulgates the Commandment, "Honor your father and mother". It is not possible to guess whether Mark's audience was unaware of or deficient in "elder care"⁴⁶, but this much is clearly happening: a) the re-affirmation of one of the Laws of the Ten Commandments; and b) the dismissal of customs which prohibit its fulfilment. Thus "Law" overrides "custom" (tradition). Moreover, if Qorban represents an extension of Pharisaic fence building, then Mark sees Jesus permitting where they prohibit. In terms of Mark's legal system, one Commandment is declared, while customs restricting its fulfilment are dismissed.

Divorce

Many commentators cite evidence that, as the Pharisees argued⁴⁷, "it was lawful" to divorce. Yet, while accepting this historical material, we should examine Mark 10,1-12 in several other ways. First, it is evidence that the topic of divorce was by no means a settled matter, even among teachers such as Shammai, Hillel, and Aqiba⁴⁸. Hence, it was the focus of many rulings, or attempted customs. Moreover, it points directly to the topic of marriage partners, which was one of the three areas of debate in the teachings of sages and rabbis. More importantly for us, we observe a formal debate over legal matters, which is our focus. And so, when "Pharisees came up to Jesus to test him and asked, 'Is it lawful (ἐξέσθιν) for a man to divorce his wife?'" (10,2), they already know the "*command* of

reports criticism of the wealth displayed in the Temple (11,15-17.28), but Mark does not indicate that this criticism belongs to pre- or post war times.

⁴⁶ MARCUS (*Mark 1-8*, 444) refers to the observation of K. BERGER (*Die Gesetzesauslegung Jesu* [Neukirchen 1972] 288): "in some Jewish texts, as in Mark, the fourth commandment is interpreted in terms of material support of parents (see e.g., b. *Qidd* 31b, 'Honor' means that he must give him food and drink, clothes and cover him, lead him in and out"; cf. Sir 3,3.8.12-16; Philo, *Decalogue* 113-118).

⁴⁷ See MARCUS, *Mark 1-8*, 699-707, and NINEHAM, *The Gospel of St. Mark*, 259-262.

⁴⁸ We cite the translation of J. CROSSLEY (*The New Testament and Jewish Law*, 69) apropos of confusion over reasons for Moses' remarks: "The House of Shammai say, 'A man should divorce his wife only because he has found grounds for it in unchastity, since it is said, *Because he found in her indecency in anything* [i.e. something objectionable] (Deut. 24.1)'. And the House of Hillel say, 'Even if she spoiled his dish, since it is said, *Because he found in her indecency in anything* [i.e. something objectionable]'. R. Aqiba says, 'Even if he found someone prettier than she, since it is said, *And it shall be if she find no favour in his eyes* (Deut. 24.1)' (*m. Git.* 9.10; cf. *Sifre* Deut. 269; *y. Sota* 1.2, 16b)".

Moses” (τί ἐνετείλατο) and that “Moses *allowed* (ἐπέτρεψεν) a man to write a *certificate* of divorce” (10,4), signifying the extensive use of legal terms here in Mark.

They do not accuse Jesus of breaking any law or custom, but engage him in an academic challenge (“to test him they asked”). As we see it, the issue is one of “law” vs. “custom”. Jesus’ response basically attacks their very question when he responds in legal language that *Moses* “wrote you this ‘commandment’ (ἐντολή) because of your hardness of heart” — not *God*. Thus significant aspects of Mark’s legal system appear. First, the authority behind Moses’ relaxation of God’s law indicates some sense of “development” of a legal system. Second, Mark re-affirms God’s *law* published in creation (Gen 1,27; 2,24) as the primary and absolute law to be followed here. Moses introduced a *custom*, for no other reason than their “hardness of heart”, a custom seen in opposition to God’s *law* ⁴⁹. Thus, Mark reports that in this instance, Jesus declares invalid the “command of *Moses*” itself, which infringes on the *law of God*. Jesus prohibits what Moses permitted.

When Jesus and disciples leave the public arena, we find another example ⁵⁰ of a ruling being made in regard to what was previously stated. “The disciples asked him again about this matter” (10,10). Jesus now declares a ruling or custom, which builds a fence around the law of God, namely, specifying both male and female initiatives in divorce and remarriage. The “Law” is the *law*, and now Jesus extends prohibitions to protect it. These specifications function as a *custom* to protect the law ⁵¹. On balance, then, Mark reports Jesus’ absolute insistence on God’s creation law, with no relaxing customs.

Marriage partners

Although Mark 6,18; 10,1-12; and 12,18-27 are conventionally treated as separate pericopae, we urge that they be examined together as instances of the more general controversy over “marriage partners” ⁵² found in

⁴⁹ The conflict between God’s law and Moses’ “law” as a concession cannot be stressed enough, especially if one sees it in terms of Mark’s legal system; see MARCUS, *Mark 8–16*, 700-701.

⁵⁰ Cf. Mark 7,14-23.

⁵¹ Yet, is this issue significant in Mark’s Gentile world? There is evidence from independent sources that some debate remained, as in Paul’s relaxation of Jesus’ law (1 Cor 7,12-16) and in the Matthean introduction of an exception to the law, “except for πορνεία” (Matt 5,32; 19,9).

⁵² For a convenient introduction to these matters, see V.P. HAMILTON, “Marriage”, *ABD* 4:559-596.

discussions of early rulings and laws in Israelite literature. According to Mark, John told Herod, "It is not lawful (οὐκ ἔξεστιν) for you to have your brother's wife" (6,18), a significant concern over a valid marriage partner⁵³. Later, Sadducees ridiculed the law of Levirate marriage, for which they asked of Jesus a "ruling": "Whose wife will she be?" (12,18-26). The historical evidence for Levirate marriage can tell only so much about the legal issues debated here. Yet it has been shown that in this regard certain marriages are lawful and others unlawful. Depending on the degree of consanguinity, Leviticus prohibits them (Lev 18,7.9. 10-13); however, permission is found in Deut 25,5-10. Jesus re-affirms the earlier "law" in Leviticus 18, and rejects the permissive custom of Deuteronomy 25, thus illustrating one aspect of Mark's legal system: a later "law" cannot override an earlier one; and so, it cannot create an exception to the law, i.e., a custom which permits behavior otherwise prohibited. Mark, of course, views John's remark to Herod favorably; and in doing so, he endorses this restriction of marriage partners. Moreover, he affirms only one law (Leviticus 18), and rejects the custom which encroached on it. Elements of Mark's legal system, then, include: 1) the knowledge of "laws", in addition to the Ten Commandments; 2) the argument that chronological priority in the Scripture upholds an earlier law against the encroachment of a later one; and 3) the use of legal terminology, such as "it is not unlawful".

Paying taxes to Caesar

Although Mark introduced this controversy with the formula, "Is it lawful (ἔξεστιν)?", this does not involve a law from Scripture, much less one of the Ten Commandments⁵⁴. In addition to discussions of other issues involved here⁵⁵, we focus on Mark's reporting of a legal controversy, which involves many elements of his system, and so we give special attention to what is meant by "lawful" in this case. As regards authority

⁵³ See K.C. HANSON – D.E. OAKMAN, *Palestine in the Time of Jesus*. Social Structures and Social Conflicts (Minneapolis, MN 1998) 31-32, 43-46, 85-86.

⁵⁴ Yet some argue that paying taxes to Caesar violates the First Commandment.

⁵⁵ As regards politics, see S.G.F. BRANDON, *Jesus and the Zealots*. A Study of the Political Factor in Primitive Christianity (Manchester 1967); M. HENGEL, *Was Jesus a Revolutionist?* (Philadelphia, PA 1971); IDEM *The Zealots*. Investigations into the Jewish Freedom Movement from Herod I until 70 A.D. (Edinburgh 1989). On rhetorical and literary issues, see D. DAUBE, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, 158-169; YOUNG – STRICKLAND, *The Rhetoric of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark*, 221-257. Even numismatics matter; see P.C. FINNEY, "The Rabbi and the Coin Portrait (Mark 12,15b, 16): Rigorism Manqué", *JBL* 112 (1993) 629-644.

to make law or custom, Mark anticipated this controversy with an earlier challenge to Jesus' authority to act as he did concerning the Temple (11,27-33) ⁵⁶. Then, although spoken sarcastically, Jesus' challengers admit his authority, for they address him as an authentic "teacher" who "truly teach[es] the way of God" (12,14). As in the case of the divorce debate, neither Jesus nor his disciples have broken any law or violated any custom; hence Mark focuses on an abstract issue of significance: "Is it lawful to pay taxes to Caesar or not? Should we pay them or should we not?" (12,14). Moreover, Jesus' interrogators are no ordinary makers of rulings, but persons of the highest status in Jerusalem: "Pharisees and Herodians" (12,13), "Sadducees" (12,18), "Scribes" (12,28); "the chief priests and the scribes and the elders" had just asked their own question (11,27). Hence authority to make a ruling here is of great importance.

The legal discourse, then, is conducted by the highest level of Israel's elite about an abstract legal matter. Elements of Mark's legal system include: 1) legal terminology "Is it lawful (ἐξεστίν;)" ; 2) a Roman law, with Israelite legal application ⁵⁷; 3) a focus on "justice", to whom is what owed; and 4) an implied contrast between the legal requirements of two sovereigns, Caesar and God. No *custom* or *norm* is in view, only a matter of *law*. But whose law?

Jesus' response is hardly a "ruling", but rather a Solomonic way of contrasting two duties, which entails immediate probability of legal enforcement. He states a principle ("to Caesar, Caesar's [...] to God, God's"), putting off giving a ruling. He puts the legal details back in his questioners' hands. Was this, however, a actual issue for Mark and his audience? Much depends on the dating of Mark and his location; if he wrote after the Roman-Jewish war and for a Gentile audience, this "law" would seem to have been solved by history. Moreover, Paul's general exhortation in Romans 13 might offer a solution to this specific issue (Rom 13,7), thus settling it, which, after the Roman-Israelite war, did not remain a crisis. Yet how widespread was this known. Mark's account of this legal debate, then, is another statement by Christians that they are good citizens and have an honorable place in the Roman world. The matter was settled for Mark and his audience.

⁵⁶ J.H. HELLERMANN, "Challenging the Authority of Jesus: Mark 11,27-33 and Mediterranean Notions of Honor and Shame", *JETS* 43 (2000) 213-228.

⁵⁷ For evidence of Judean resistance to paying taxes to Caesar, see MARCUS, *Mark 8-16*, 822-823.

Enforcement

Customs and laws must in some way be enforced; there must be some mechanism to ensure compliance, lest the customs or laws be simply disregarded. Normally, public expressions of honor and shame would suffice⁵⁸. This would ordinarily be enough to enforce norms, such as breaking agreements for reciprocal labor, lending and borrowing, betrothals, and the like. Since everyone knows everyone else's business, all already know what was agreed to, and so a violated "norm" would easily be enforced by the threat of negative public opinion. Conversely, some laws came with public penalty for failure, even several of the Ten Commandments⁵⁹. But some political authority must enforce these penalties, lest a feud develop when kinship groups attempted to enforce them. Data, however, on the enforcement of customs are hard to find, much less evaluate. It is unclear in Mark's narrative who would enforce non-observance of customs. Pharisees may make declarations that "It is not lawful" to do something, but we do not know if they could enforce compliance⁶⁰. Mark states that "official" persons challenged Jesus, Pharisees individually or in combination with scribes and Herodians, that is, public persons credited with some form of "authority". But was anything enforced? Was anything ever imposed on Jesus? He seems to have evaded all public shame until the cross.

Furthermore, much depends on whether we consider that Mark reports traditions about Jesus himself or that he narrates how affairs were conducted in his Gentile world. Concerning the latter, we have data about the enforcement mechanisms in synagogue assemblies in Acts, in several of Paul's own letters, and Paul before Roman magistrates. Paul merely tells us that he was mistreated⁶¹, whereas Acts reports enforcement in some detail.

⁵⁸ Honor and shame invest "enforcement". After several imprisonments of Peter and the apostles, the council began to enforce its ruling that Peter should *not* speak about Jesus with a flogging: "And when they had beat them and charged them not to speak in the name of Jesus, they let them go" (Acts 5,40). But what the council considered "shame", the apostles judged to be "honor": "They left the council, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer dishonor for the name" (5,41).

⁵⁹ Enforcement of certain laws rested upon clear knowledge of what punishment was attached to non-compliance. Stoning could befall blasphemers, disobedient sons, and adulterers; theft would require restitution, and even the severing of a hand. The prophet Daniel testifies to the punishment for false testimony.

⁶⁰ A fuller consideration of rule making and rule enforcement can be found in the sociological theory of labeling and deviance; see B.J. MALINA – J.H. NEYREY, *Calling Jesus Names. The Social Value of Labels in Matthew* (Sonoma, CA 1988) 35-67.

⁶¹ See J.A. GLANCY, "Boasting of Beatings (2 Corinthians 11,23-25)", *JBL* 123 (2004) 99-135.

First, Acts narrates a violent debate over customs between Stephen and those in Jerusalem who belonged to the synagogue of Freedmen. This, of course, is a legal matter; the setting seems to be a court, where “false witnesses” charge: “This man never stops saying things against this holy place *and the law*; for we have heard him say that this Jesus of Nazareth will destroy this place and *will change the customs that Moses handed on to us*” (Acts 6,13-14, emphasis added). They proceed to enforce observance of traditional customs by killing Stephen.

Paul insisted that he “committed no offence” against the “the law of the Judeans [...] or against the Temple” (25,8), but popular gossip said otherwise: “They have been told that you teach all the Jews living among the Gentiles *to forsake Moses*, and that you tell them *not to circumcise* their children or *observe the customs*” (21,21.28). Enforcement of customs called for Paul’s demise (21,27-36). So, disregard for “customs” provoked censure: stoning for Stephen, and death for Paul. Enforcement, for sure.

Paul, flogged in synagogues five times (2 Cor 11,24), was expelled from them (Acts 13,50) and chased from cities; on occasion, he was stoned (Acts 14,5.19). Diaspora synagogues aroused Roman magistrates to chastise Paul publicly with rods (Acts 16,22; 2 Cor 11,24) ⁶². Public shaming was the preferred censure, with expulsion from a city a genuine possibility ⁶³. Conversely, Paul boasted that, when younger, he was a Pharisee’s Pharisee, which he manifested by trying to enforce Jerusalem customs upon those in diaspora synagogues ⁶⁴. He obtained from Jerusalem’s highest official, its high priest, letters authorizing him to enter the synagogue in Damascus and bind “those who belonged to the Way” (9,1-2). In a repetition of this, Paul says that “in every synagogue”, presumably in Damascus, he imprisoned and “beat” them (22,9).

These observations suggest that according to Mark’s narrative, enforcement of customs was attempted by public challenge and by rebuke from

⁶² J.A. GLANCY’s significant article (“Boasting of Beatings [2 Corinthians 11,23-24]”, *JBL* 123 [2004] 99-135) provides an excellent resource on the social meaning of bodily scars, especially those inflicted on the back of a person. She discusses them, moreover, in terms of the cultural value of honor and shame.

⁶³ Of relevance for this issue is Luke’s report that Pilate intended a chastisement of Jesus (i.e., beating) as sufficient for a minor violation of some custom or law. See R.E. BROWN, *The Death of the Messiah* (New York 1993) 1:792-793, 851-853. Also relevant is Heb 12,3-14. Moreover, further reflection should include consideration of “exile” in antiquity as a most shameful punishment.

⁶⁴ See A. HULTGREN, “Paul’s Pre-Christian Persecutions of the Church: Their Purpose, Locale and Nature”, *JBL* 95 (1976) 97-111.

persons claiming authority (cf. 13,9-10). Perceived violators would be publicly reproached in public. But Mark reports that all attempts to convict or rebuke Jesus were unsuccessful. Finally, we can detect a common strategy used against Jesus in Mark and in Paul's letters.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

1. Along the way, we have attempted to present what is meant by a "legal system", which is more than a catalogue of "laws" and "customs". Given what we have learned by reading Mark in this way, he can be said to have a "legal system" consisting of the following:

- An easily identifiable *collection of Laws*, written by God, promulgated, and observed, namely, the Ten Commandments;
- *Legal terminology*, such as "unlawful [...] lawful"; "law" (ἐντολή) vs. "tradition" (παράδοσις); "command" (ἐνετείλατο) and "allow" (ἐπέτρεπεν), etc.;
- A clear sense of the *authority* behind Law and later its development: both *God's laws* vs. *Moses' relaxation of God's laws*, and *God's laws* vs. *traditions of men*;
- Acceptance of *some sense of historical development*: in general, the Law given in writing by God, which Mark calls ἐντολή; moreover, two other Laws of God are re-affirmed, namely, God's law about marriage in Genesis and the law governing sexual partners in Leviticus 18, with all else considered secondary or later making of fences around Torah;
- *Argument* for the primacy of early or fundamental law of God over later "laws", such as Moses' ἐντολή;
- Except for marriage partners, Jesus may be said to *permit* what his opponents *prohibit*.

2. When examining Mark's legal system, one cannot underestimate the extent of controversy and debate over *legal* issues in the whole narrative. Accepting Mark's emphasis that the primary role and status of Jesus was that of "teacher", one recognizes that the endless challenges to Jesus take place over rulings about three basic legal topics: Sabbath, foods, broadly understood, and marriage partners. This, too, gives shape to the legal system narrated by Mark, for these topics are the concern of rule-makers such as sages and rabbis and also were the legal matters that Paul and the early Christians debated and tried to settle.

3. It is beyond the scope of this study to settle the issues of Mark's dating, location, and relationship to the historical Jesus. Yet it matters greatly that Mark records Jesus affirming "Law" in a definitive way, which may be construed as an affirmation of the current legal system in Mark's Gentile communities. As far as Mark is concerned, certain matters were settled by the one with authority to do so.

4. The process of collecting materials about a legal system in Mark does not depend on a scholar's imagination, for what is reported here can be compared with the way other writers of the Greco-Roman world described the contents of their own versions of a legal system. Aristotle, Herrenius, and Cicero all take up — in part or in whole — what we find in Mark. The presence of these materials in Mark, moreover, make them salient to us precisely because they form a system in the eyes of contemporaries.

5. When we turn to formal discussions of legal systems, we learn of classifications made by the ancients that can give further specificity to legal matters in Mark. The ancients were wont to distinguish "norm" from "custom" from "law". These ancient categories can be refined in modern anthropology of law to provide a workable classification of items in the Markan controversies. Thus, Mark knows of *Law*, given in writing by God, which constituted for him the precise body of laws, which, when followed, would lead to "inherit[ing] eternal life". Mark recognizes *customs* introduced by man, which either extend prohibitions around laws or relax them, thereby weakening the law. All of these Jesus (and Mark) dismiss. Mark would make sense in a Jewish synagogue, but our study indicates that his "system" would be equally understood in a Gentile context.

6. This study of Mark's legal system invites further consideration of New Testament issues beyond the scope of what is discussed here. The outline we proposed earlier about the presence of debate about the lawfulness of the three topics covered in Mark should be examined more closely. It would appear that debate over Sabbath observance ceased as Christians adopted the first day of the week as their holy day. But concerning controversy over foods and marriage partners, Paul was intensely involved in questions of what was "lawful" (ἐξέσθιν) or not. His remark πάντα ἐξέσθιν prefaces remarks on *marriage partners* (1 Cor 6,12) and *foods* (1 Cor 10,23). The question is not whether Mark follows Paul, but whether the correspondence between ἐξέσθιν in regard to marriage partners and foods indicates an early, but settled matter, or one that continued to be problematic, at least in certain places.

7. Finally, one more opening for further inquiry might be the relationship of norms, customs, and laws in regard to ancient discussions of "justice". "Justice" meant "to preserve *ancestral customs* and *institutions* and *the established laws*, and to tell the truth when interest is at stake, and *to keep agreements*". This was immediately followed by a list of "duties" directed to "the gods, then to the spirits, then to country and parents, then to the departed" (Aristotle, *Virtues and Vices*, 5.2-3). Therefore, a way of studying "customs, institutions, and established laws" would be to search for discussions of "duties" in antiquity. Moreover, even according to Aristotle, two basic institutions in society were acknowledged: "politics" and "kinship", which are the focus of duties; "politics" = "duties to gods and country" and "kinship" = "duties to parents and departed". Documented lists of household duties could be examined accordingly.

Jesuit Hall
3601 Lindell Blvd.
St. Louis, MO 63108
U.S.A.

Jerome H. NEYREY

SUMMARY

Mark narrates the traditional controversies between Jesus and others. But it appears that he operates out of a "legal system". This includes the Ten Commandments, the law given by God. Mark acknowledges their authority and publication, which grounds Jesus' statements, thus excluding expansions which permit and prohibit. But these controversies can be clarified by the use of the anthropology of law, which identifies "norms", "customs", and "law". This allows us to assess Mark's systematic resistance by Jesus to anything that would create binding customs.

ABSCHAFFUNG DER TORA BEI GESETZESKENNERN? BEOBACHTUNGEN AN UND ZU RÖM 7,1-6

I. EIN INTERESSANTER, UMSTRITTENER SACHVERHALT: RÖM 7,1-6 UND DAS GESETZ

Die Passage Röm 7,1-6 kann aus mehreren Gründen mit einer gewissen Aufmerksamkeit rechnen. So fällt auf, dass diese Verse die Vokabel νόμος recht häufig bieten, nämlich 8mal (genauer: in 7,1a.1b.2a.2b.3.4.5.6). Das ist nämlich selbst innerhalb des übergreifenden Zusammenhangs 1,16 – 11,36 (s. bes. 2,12-17; 3,19-31; 7,7-14 [und vgl. Gal 2,16-21]) beachtlich, der seinerseits etwa durch die Termini εὐαγγέλιον (hier: 4mal, zuerst in 1,16, zuletzt in 11,28), δικαιοσύνη (hier: 31mal [oder: 32mal], zuerst in 1,17, zuletzt in 10,10) und eben auch νόμος (hier: 69mal, zuerst in 2,12, zuletzt in 10,5) zusammengehalten wird. Interesse kann natürlich, zweitens, auch das Faktum auslösen, dass in vv. 2-3 (vgl. dazu auch v. 1) zum besseren Verständnis der Thematik das Exempel einer verheirateten Frau und ihrer rechtlichen Bindung an den Ehemann (s. v. 2 [ὁ νόμος τοῦ ἀνδρός]) eingebracht wird. Überdies macht, drittens, hellhörig, dass man es offenkundig nicht sonderlich leicht hat, sich innerhalb der exegetischen Szene hinsichtlich des hier im Römerbrief Gemeinten zu einigen. Ernst Käsemann z.B. urteilt, es gelte nach diesen Versen: „Nicht nur die Fluchgewalt des Gesetzes [...] oder die Tyrannei einer Idee der Legalität [...] sind abgeschafft, sondern die Tora als solche“¹. Hingegen vertritt Klaus Wengst die Auffassung: „Dass die von Paulus Angeredeten für die Tora tot sind und dem Auferweckten [...] gehören, versetzt [...] in alles andere als in Gesetzlosigkeit“². Diese Differenz im Bereich jüngerer Auslegungsversuche ist

¹ E. KÄSEMAN, *An die Römer* (HNT 8a; Tübingen 1974) 181. Vgl. etwa U. SCHNELLE, *Paulus: Leben und Denken* (de Gruyter Studium; Berlin ²2014) 354, überdies S. VOLLENWEIDER, *Freiheit als neue Schöpfung. Eine Untersuchung zur Eleutheria bei Paulus und in seiner Umwelt* (FRLANT 147; Göttingen 1989) 343, ferner die Literaturhinweise bei G. BALTES, „Freiheit vom Gesetz“ — eine paulinische Formel? Paulus zwischen jüdischem Gesetz und christlicher Freiheit“, *Der jüdische Messias Jesus und sein jüdischer Apostel Paulus* (hg.v. A.D. BAUM – D. HÄUSSER – E.E. REHFELD) (WUNT II.425; Tübingen 2016) 266-314, 272 Anm. 39.

² K. WENGST, „*Freut euch, ihr Völker, mit Gottes Volk!*“ Israel und die Völker als Thema des Paulus — ein Gang durch den Römerbrief (Stuttgart 2008) 251. Vgl. etwa J.D.G. DUNN, „Was Paul against the Law? The Law in Galatians and Romans: A Test-Case of Text in Context“, in DERS., *The New Perspective on Paul. Collected Essays* (WUNT 185; Tübingen 2005) 259-277 (zuerst: 1995), 275.

im Übrigen — abgesehen von unterschiedlichen Interpretationsgewohnheiten und von auch mit ihnen verbundenen „Vorverständnissen“ — nicht zuletzt auf bestimmte Textmerkmale zurückzuführen. Merkwürdig ist in diesem Abschnitt beim Wort νόμος insbesondere, dass eingangs die „Brüder“ als γινώσκουσιν [...] νόμον, als das Gesetz Kennende angesprochen werden ³, während sie offenkundig doch auch zu den in v. 6 (vgl. v. 4) mit der ersten Person Plural in den Blick Gefassten gehören, von denen es da heißt: „Jetzt aber sind wir vom Gesetz frei geworden“ bzw. „entbunden“.

Der Passus (Röm) 7,1-6 vermag es also auch heutzutage fraglos, einen neugierig zu machen. Vorankommen beim Verstehen der Aussagen wird man vermutlich nur, wenn man scheinbar oder wirklich widersprüchlichen Formulierungen gerade nicht ausweicht. Mit einigen darauf bezüglichen Hinweisen soll darum nun eingesetzt werden (s. II.), und Beobachtungen zum Aufbau (s. III.; vgl. IV.) sowie zu Inhaltlichem (s. IV.-VI.) sind dem hinzuzufügen, um dann auf diese Weise möglichst zu einer Beantwortung der Frage nach einer etwaigen paulinischen Abschaffung der Tora gelangen zu können (s. bes. VI.).

II. SPANNUNGSMOMENTE INNERHALB DES ARGUMENTATIONSGEFÜGES

Schon benannt wurde soeben das Spannungsverhältnis, dass die eingangs genannten ἀδελφοί in 7,1-6 zum einen als γινώσκουσιν [...] νόμον angesprochen werden, und zwar sogleich in v. 1, und dass sie zum anderen (gemäß v. 4 „dem Gesetz getötet“ und) gemäß v. 6 „vom Gesetz entbunden“ ⁴ zu sein scheinen. Dieses Nebeneinander führt natürlich, wie ebenfalls bereits berührt, zu der Erwägung, ob es (in v. 4 und) in v. 6 nicht letztlich um so etwas wie eine nun zu konstatierende vollständige Irrelevanz des νόμος, um seine eigentlich schon vollzogene Abschtüttelung oder

³ R. BERGMEIER, „Das Gesetz im Römerbrief“, in DERS., *Das Gesetz im Römerbrief und andere Studien zum Neuen Testament* (WUNT 121; Tübingen 2000) 31-102, 66, interpretiert auf „Judenchristen“ hin. Anders z.B. H. LIETZMANN, *An die Römer* (HNT 8; Tübingen 1933) 72; J.D.G. DUNN, *Romans 1-8* (Word Biblical Commentary; Dallas, TX 1988) 359; K. FINSTERBUSCH, *Die Thora als Lebensweisung für Heidenchristen*. Studien zur Bedeutung der Thora für die paulinische Ethik (StUNT 20; Göttingen 1996) 47, 49 (samt Anm. 53); M. WOLTER, *Der Brief an die Römer 1: Römer 1-8* (EKK VI/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn – Ostfildern 2014) 409-410 (samt Anm. 3); ferner H. LICHTENBERGER, *Das Ich Adams und das Ich der Menschheit*. Studien zum Menschenbild in Römer 7 (WUNT 164; Tübingen 2004) bes. 117. Vgl. unten Anm. 7.

⁴ W. BAUER, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der frühchristlichen Literatur* (hg.v. K. ALAND – B. ALAND) (Berlin – New York ⁶1988) 848-849 (Art. καταργέω), 849.

Abschaffung geht, eines „Gesetzes“, das die angesprochenen Personen indes im Augenblick sehr wohl „kennen“. Eine Beantwortung dieser Frage ist schwierig, sollte aber doch auch nicht unmöglich sein, wird in dem vorliegenden Papier deshalb versucht werden.

Mit der angesprochenen, durch v. 1 (sowie durch v. 4) und durch v. 6 bedingten Ambiguität ist die Problematik verknüpft, an was man in dem Passus eben bei dem Terminus νόμος zu denken haben wird. Klar dürfte sein, dass es um eine Art Gesetzeskorpus geht. Ein Element davon wird ja durch den in v. 2 (vgl. auch v. 3 [v.l.]) verwandten Ausdruck ὁ νόμος τοῦ ἀνδρός bezeichnet bzw. durch den Genitiv τοῦ ἀνδρός hervorgehoben. Etwas schwieriger zu sagen ist, ob das Wort νόμος zumindest in vv. 2-3 „den allgemeinen Sinn von Norm [...] hat“⁵ oder ob die Vokabel hier doch eher die Tora meint⁶. Zugunsten der ersteren Möglichkeit lässt sich natürlich auf das römische setting des Adressatenkreises verweisen⁷, ferner darauf, dass „die Polyandrie sowohl im Judentum als auch bei Griechen und Römern dem geltenden Eherecht widersprach“⁸. Freilich: Bereits v. 1 gibt die Gesetzesthematik vor, und zwar doch wohl *ohne* expliziten Bezug auf ein „Eherecht“. Insofern wird beim νόμος-Gebrauch von v. 1 gerade auch der rückwärtige Kontext in Betracht zu ziehen sein, nicht zuletzt die Verwendung eben dieses Worts in 5,13.20 und 6,14-15. Und jedenfalls 5,13 (vgl. v. 14: „Mose“) und 5,20 lassen keinerlei Zweifel daran, dass dieses Lexem da auf das mosaische Gesetz abzielt. Und für den Verweis auf die in 7,2-3 beschriebene Ehe-Regel (die Paulus ja bekanntlich auch in 1Kor 7,39 anspricht) fehlt es denn auch im jüdischen Bereich nicht an Exempeln⁹ — d.h. im Blick auf das folgende Prinzip: Unzulässigkeit des Versuchs bzw. des Unternehmens, seitens einer verheirateten Frau (bereits) *während* der ehelichen Verbindung mit ihrem Gatten, dem noch nicht verstorbenen Ehepartner, eine weitere entsprechende (eheliche/sexuelle) Beziehung einzugehen. Bei Josephus, *Ant.* 18,136 (vgl. dazu auch §§109-110) heißt es so in recht kritischem Duktus mit Bezug auf eine — mit ähnlicher Einschätzung — auch im Neuen Testament (s. bes. Mk 6,17-18 par.) erwähnte weibliche Person aus politisch führenden Kreisen: „Herodias, taking into her head to flout the way of our fathers [!], married Herod [Antipas], her husband’s brother [...]; to do this she parted

⁵ R. BULTMANN, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Tübingen 1968) 260. Ähnlich z.B. KÄSEMANN, *Römer*, 179.

⁶ In diesem Sinne äußert sich z.B. U. WILCKENS, *Der Brief an die Römer 2: Röm 6–11* (EKK VI/2; Zürich [usw.] 1980) 63-64. Offener: K. HAACKER, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer* (ThHK 6; Leipzig 2012) 167-168.

⁷ S. etwa KÄSEMANN, *Römer*, 179. Vgl. indes Gal (4,8-10 und) 4,21.

⁸ HAACKER, *Römer*, 167.

⁹ S. dazu etwa HAACKER, *Römer*, 168 (samt Anm. 9).

from a living [!] husband“¹⁰ (d.h.: von Herodes Boethos). Es wird darum der Terminus νόμος in 7,1 und dann auch in 7,2-6 sehr wahrscheinlich letztlich auf die Tora zu beziehen sein¹¹.

Nicht als gänzlich spannungsfrei kann man es auch empfinden, wie in der Passage 7,1-6 das Moment des Todes zur Sprache kommt. Das Verb ἀποθνήσκειν wird in v. 2-3 bei den die Ehe-Regel betreffenden Formulierungen zweimal im Blick auf den Zeitpunkt des Versterbens des (ersten) (Ehe-)Manns verwandt, sofern seine (Ehe-)Frau eben von da an „vom Gesetz des Mannes“ „entbunden“ und „frei“ sei. V. 6 hat es zwar auch mit der „Entbindung“ „vom Gesetz“ zu tun. Aber hier erscheinen die so „Entbundenen“ nun nahezu *selber* als Sterbende, genauer als „Gestorbene“¹², und zwar für das „worin“ sie bzw. „wir festgehalten waren“¹³. Ähnlich wird in v. 4, wie schon angesprochen, mit einem anderen Verb, mit θανατοῦν, „töten“, gesagt, dass die „Brüder“ „dem [bzw. im Hinblick auf das] Gesetz getötet worden“ seien¹⁴. Und damit lässt sich wohl auch der einzige θάνατος-Beleg des Abschnitts verbinden, nicht zuletzt sofern es da, in v. 5, heißt, dass zuvor „die Leidenschaften der Sünden, die das Gesetz erregte, in unseren Gliedern wirksam waren, sodass wir dem Tod Frucht brachten [εἰς τὸ καρποφορῆσαι τῷ θανάτῳ]“¹⁵. Die Übertragung der Ehe-Regel auf die Situation der christlichen Gemeinde funktioniert also nicht ohne gewisse Holprigkeiten¹⁵. Vergleiche hinken halt nicht selten. Aber deutlich wird bei der in dem Passus begegnenden Verwendung der Todes-Diktion doch fraglos: Sie hat es hier schwerlich mit so etwas wie dem oder einem „Tod“ des Gesetzes, sondern mit einer anderen, freilich ebenfalls ganz gravierenden Veränderung, nämlich von bzw. an Personen zu tun, insofern auch mit einer entsprechenden Modifikation der Rolle des νόμος für diese Menschen. Als heikel wird dabei gerade erachtet, dass sie früher — aufgrund eines Zusammenhangs von „Leidenschaften“, „Sünden“

¹⁰ Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*, Books XVIII-XX, with an English translation by L.H. FELDMAN (LCL 433; London – Cambridge, MA 1969) 93. Vgl. im Übrigen WOLTER, *Römer 1*, 414.

¹¹ Vgl. LICHTENBERGER, *Das Ich Adams*, 110-115.

¹² Vgl. VOLLENWEIDER, *Freiheit als neue Schöpfung*, 343.

¹³ S. die Übersetzung bei D. ZELLER, *Der Brief an die Römer* (RNT; Regensburg 1985) 131. Vgl. etwa BALTES, „Freiheit vom Gesetz“, 274 (samt Anm. 41).

¹⁴ Vgl. BAUER, *Wörterbuch*, 714 (Art. θανατόω) (wo im Blick auf Röm 7,4 vom „dat. incomm.“ die Rede), indes auch BALTES, „Freiheit vom Gesetz“, 276-278, 277 („*dativus iudicantis*“). Vgl. DUNN, *Romans 1-8*, 361.

¹⁵ S. dazu etwa KÄSEMANN, *Römer*, 179, ferner: LIETZMANN, *Römer*, 71-72; H. SCHLIER, *Der Römerbrief* (HThK VI; Freiburg – Basel – Wien 1977) 216; VOLLENWEIDER, *Freiheit als neue Schöpfung*, bes. 343; A. GIENIUSZ, „Rom 7,1-6: Lack of Imagination? Function of the Passage in the Argumentation of Rom 6,1 – 7,6“, *Bib 74* (1993) 389-400, bes. 392-393, 398 (samt Anm. 27); WOLTER, *Römer 1*, 411 (samt Anm. 3); BALTES, „Freiheit vom Gesetz“, 275-276, 279 (samt Anm. 43).

und „Gesetz“ — letztlich „zugunsten des Todes Frucht erbrachten“. Dass es damit ein Ende haben sollte, kommt bei einer schon zuvor, in v. 4, erfolgenden weiteren Verwendung des Lexems καρποφορεῖν zum Ausdruck. Da finden sich ja die Worte ἵνα καρποφορήσωμεν τῷ θεῷ also: „damit wir Frucht bringen“, nämlich „Gott gegenüber“ — und nicht „dem Tod gegenüber“ (bzw.: nicht „zugunsten des Todes“) —.

Immerhin indirekt angesprochen wurde im Vorangehenden noch eine weitere, eine, wenn man so will, doppelte „Irregularität“ des Abschnitts. Mit den einleitenden Worten ἡ ἀγνοεῖτε, ἀδελφοί — dem Beginn einer Frage — ist die zweite Person Plural verbunden, und dieses sprachliche Merkmal wird in v. 4a nach abermaligem ἀδελφοί (nun: ἀδελφοί μου [vgl. Röm 15,14]) wieder aufgegriffen. Dazwischen, in v. 1b und bei dem in vv. 2-3 zur Ehe-Regel Gesagten, sind die Formulierungen indes durch die dritte Person Singular bestimmt, während dann ab v. 4c in der ersten Person Plural geredet wird. Diese Beobachtungen betreffen natürlich schon Indizien der Gliederung des Passus. Die wird denn auch sogleich noch etwas genauer in den Blick zu nehmen sein.

Zuvor sei indes mit Bezug auf die betrachteten Spannungsmomente summierend Folgendes festgehalten: Hinsichtlich des recht umstrittenen Problems, ob Paulus in Röm 7,1-6 vielleicht auf eine zumindest eigentlich schon vollzogene Abschaffung des νόμος hinauswolle, wird ausdrücklich gesagt, dass die Adressatinnen und Adressaten sehr wohl auch derzeit um diese Größe wissen. Bei ihr dürfte man es eben mit der Tora zu tun haben. Außerdem geht es hier kaum um den oder einen „Tod“ des Gesetzes, vielmehr um einen ziemlich radikalen Veränderungsprozess von Menschen. Der betrifft nicht zuletzt auch eine Neujustierung bei dem, was das Gesetz für sie bedeutet hat und bedeuten soll.

III. ZUR GLIEDERUNG DES PASSUS

Das bereits zur Ehe-Regel und zur Verwendung der dritten Person Singular sowie der ersten und zweiten Person Plural Ausgeführte macht es einigermaßen leicht, den Aufbau der Passage 7,1-6 wenigstens in etwa zu erfassen. Zumal aufgrund des bislang Beobachteten (und unter Verweis auf den Wortlaut [von v. 6b]) sei versucht, wichtige Struktur-Momente knapp zu notieren:

Vv. 1-3: Zum Gesetz

V. 1a: Die angesprochenen ἀδελφοί als Kenner des Gesetzes

Vv. 1b-3: Dauer des „Herrschens“ des Gesetzes

- Sein κυριεύειν über eine Person durch deren Lebenszeit begrenzt (v. 1b),
- durch die Ehe-Regel illustriert (vv. 2-3)

Vv. 4-6: Gesetz und Christus-Anhänger(innen)

V. 4: Ein Veränderungsgeschehen bei den ἀδελφοί (s. bes. vv. 4a-4b [„ihr“]), überhaupt bei Christus-Anhänger(inne)n (s. bes. v. 4c [„wir“])

Vv. 5-6: Ein Wechsel gerade auch in deren Leben

- Einst auf ein καρποφορῆσαι „dem Tod gegenüber“ hinauslaufend (v. 5),
- nun so etwas wie ein δουλεύειν „in der Neuheit des Geistes“¹⁶ (v. 6)

„Die beiden Teile VV. 1-3 und VV. 4-6“ werden auch von Ulrich Wilckens unterschieden, und er weist ebenfalls auf „die doppelte Anrede ‚Brüder‘ (V. 1 und V. 4)“ hin¹⁷. Nicht ganz unumstritten ist gleichwohl, ob das in v. 1b Gesagte der Sache nach wirklich von dem in vv. 2-3 Ausgeführten zu unterscheiden ist¹⁸. Für diese Option¹⁹ dürfte indes doch immerhin dies sprechen, dass in v. 1b der recht allgemein gehaltene Terminus ἄνθρωπος, „Mensch“, verwandt wird, während danach, in vv. 2-3, mehrfach (nämlich: nicht weniger als 7mal) vom „Mann“ (ἀνὴρ), vom Ehemann, oder (2mal) vom „anderen Mann“, die Rede ist — zudem einmal, in v. 2, hinsichtlich der Ehefrau das Adjektiv ὑπανδρος²⁰ gebraucht wird —.

IV. EHE-REGEL UND CHRISTUS-BEZUG

Innerhalb der Passage 7,1-6 bildet die Ehe-Regel, vv. 2-3, so etwas wie ein Scharnier. Sie ist ja, erstens, ein Beispiel für die direkt vorangehende Aussage von v. 1b, dass das κυριεύειν des Gesetzes über einen Menschen mit dessen Tod ein Ende finde. Dies Exempel kommt zunächst im v. 2 zur Sprache, und zwar mit dem Nacheinander von „Bindung [...] der Frau an d. Mann“²¹, genauer: „an den lebenden Mann durch das Gesetz“, und von ihrem Entbunden-Werden „vom Gesetz des Mannes“. In v. 3a wird jene „Bindung“ noch ein wenig erläutert: Deren Vernachlässigung bzw. Negierung durch die Ehefrau führe zu dem Verdikt, sie habe als μοιχαλὶς, „Ehebrecherin“, zu gelten. *Nach* dem Tod des (einstigen)

¹⁶ So die Übersetzung bei ZELLER, *Römer*, 131.

¹⁷ So jeweils: WILCKENS, *Römer* 2, 63. Vgl. bes.: N.T. WRIGHT, *The Climax of the Covenant*. Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology (Edinburgh 1991) 217; GIENIUSZ, „Rom 7,1-6“, 396; BERGMEIER, „Gesetz im Römerbrief“, 67; WOLTER, *Römer* 1, 409, 411.

¹⁸ Vgl. etwa KÄSEMANN, *Römer*, 179.

¹⁹ Die soeben angesprochene Option fügt sich im Übrigen gut zu der (oben [bei] Anm. 4-11 vertretenen) Auffassung, beim in 7,1-6 verwandten Terminus νόμος gehe es um die Tora. Die bei Bill. III, 232, 234, aufgeführten „rabbiniischen Parallelen“ (ZELLER, *Römer*, 131) laufen nämlich auf den folgenden Satz hinaus: „Ein Toter ist von Gesetzeserfüllung befreit“ (ZELLER, *Römer*, 131; vgl. SCHLIER, *Römerbrief*, 215, indes auch WOLTER, *Römer* 1, 410).

²⁰ Vgl. zu diesem Terminus GIENIUSZ, „Rom 7, 1-6“, 393-394.

²¹ BAUER, *Wörterbuch*, 355-356 (Art. δέω), 356.

Ehemanns indes könne eine solche Negativ-Kategorisierung, wie v. 3b fortführt, bei einer Verbindung der betreffenden Frau mit „einem anderen Mann“ *keine* Berechtigung mehr beanspruchen. Bereits damit ist recht deutlich, dass die Ehe-Regel hier, zweitens — und vor allem —, in einigermaßen metaphorischer Weise den *Christus-Bezug* jedenfalls der Adressatinnen und Adressaten erhellen soll. Auch da geht es ja offenkundig um eine Änderung, richtiger: um die (zumindest eigentlich) schon erfolgte *Ablösung eines älteren Stadiums durch ein deutlich anderes*.

Die Übertragung dieses Bildes eben hin auf das Terrain des Christus-Bezugs ist dann in den nachfolgenden Versen des Abschnitts thematisch, d.h. in vv. 4-6. Dabei fällt — abgesehen vom „ihr“-„wir“-Übergang (von vv. 4a-4b zu vv. 4c-6 [vgl. bes. Gal 4,6b]) — zunächst eine recht heftige Akzentuierung des früheren Stadiums auf: Eben Merkmale dieser Phase bestimmen v. 5 gänzlich, und in v. 4 sowie in v. 6 kommt ebenfalls Derartiges zur Sprache, und zwar neben dem in positivem Sinne formulierten, das sich unmittelbar auf die nun (hoffentlich) erreichte Situation bezieht. Selbst die abschließenden Worte des Passus haben es auch noch mit dem älteren Stadium zu tun, sofern hier beim Reden vom δουλεύειν zwar die Näherbestimmung „in der Neuheit des Geistes“ voransteht, aber eine sozusagen ultimative Abgrenzung darauf noch eigens folgt: καὶ οὐ παλαιότητι γράμματος.

Dass der mit dem Bild beabsichtigte Vergleich ein wenig hinkt, wurde schon notiert. Auf der Bildebene ist es nämlich, wie bereits angesprochen, gerade der (Ehe-)Mann der Frau, welcher stirbt, während dann danach die Todes-Diktion im Blick auf die Adressatinnen und Adressaten gebraucht wird. Es heißt in v. 4a ja: „ihr seid dem Gesetz getötet worden“. Die *Zweiteiligkeit des Bildes* wird von Paulus aber doch fraglos mit einigem Nachdruck *für den zu erhellenden Bereich fruchtbar gemacht*. Sie wird offenkundig durch die jeweilige Relation zum „Mann“ sowie zum „anderen Mann“ markiert und auch durch so etwas wie ein die beiden Phasen trennendes Moment, nämlich durch das „Sterben“ eben des ersten Manns. In der „Sache“ geht es dem Apostel um die Ablösung des einen Stadiums durch ein anderes. Freilich, man hat es dabei dann bemerkenswerterweise nicht mit zwei *verschiedenen* Männern zu tun, gemäß vv. 4a-4b vielmehr zweimal mit Christus, mit dem sterbenden und mit dem auferstandenen Christus: Zunächst findet sich so die Wendung διὰ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, und dann ist von „einem anderen“ die Rede, von „dem, der von den Toten auferweckt worden ist“²². Es sind auch nicht eigentlich die ehelichen

²² Vgl. bes. DUNN, *Romans 1–8*, 369-370, und BERGMEIER, „Gesetz im Römerbrief“, 67. Nach VOLLENWEIDER, *Freiheit als neue Schöpfung*, 343, indes soll es sich hier „nur [!] um die Relation von Gesetz und Glaubenden“ handeln.

bzw. sexuellen Beziehungen einer Frau, die sich in dem zu erhellenden Bereich verändern. Vielmehr wird in diesen Versen bedacht, dass sich Status und Leben von zahlreichen Menschen ganz grundlegend gewandelt haben müssten, nämlich von Menschen mit einem spezifischen Christus-Bezug.

Die soeben angesprochenen Formulierungen, welche Personen mit einem solchen Christus-Bezug betreffen und zudem durch so etwas wie Zweiteiligkeit bestimmt sind, hängen fraglos mit dem im vorangehenden Kapitel des Briefs, in Röm 6,1/2-11/23, zur Taufe Gesagten zusammen²³. Danach sind *die Gläubigen* ja eben durch die Taufe *mit Christi Tod und Auferweckung verbunden* (s. bes. 6,4-5.8-9). Der enge Konnex der beiden Kapitel ist auch angesichts weiterer terminologischer Berührungen nicht zu leugnen. So finden sich etwa die in 7,1-6 begegnenden Wörter ἀποθνῆσκειν, θάνατος, κυριεύειν, νεκρός und νόμος ebenfalls im vorangehenden Kapitel, und das gilt entsprechend auch für ἐγείρειν, ζῆν, καινότης, und καταργεῖν, überdies z.B. für δουλεύειν (7,6; 6,6), für (μέλος bzw.) μέλη (7,5; 6,13.19)²⁴ und für σῶμα (7,4; 6,6.12). Ferner kommt das Lexem ἁμαρτία hier wie dort vor (insgesamt: 17mal), im Plural freilich lediglich in 7,5 (τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν). Er, der in den sog. Protopaulinen²⁵ eher selten verwendet wird, gehört bekanntlich nicht zuletzt der vorpaulinischen Evangeliumsformel an, nämlich 1Kor 15,3b-5 (v. 3b: ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν [vgl. v. 1: εὐαγγέλιον]; vgl. vv. 11, 14). Sie ihrerseits ist eben zweiteilig, spricht nämlich in vv. 3b-4a von Jesu Tod und Begräbnis, sodann in vv. 4b-5 von seiner Auferweckung und seinem „Erscheinen“ (vor Zeugen). Die Taufe hat es also etwa auch in Röm 6 fraglos mit diesem oder einem ähnlichen Christusbekenntnis zu tun (wie denn auch in 6,17 von „der Gestalt der Lehre“ die Rede ist, „der ihr übergeben worden seid“²⁶). Insofern verweist eben die Zweiteiligkeit von Röm 7,4-6 recht deutlich auf das seinerzeitige (und auch schon vorpaulinische) Evangelium²⁷.

Man wird darum festhalten können, dass die *Zweiteiligkeit des Bildes bzw. der „Bildhälfte“*, also von vv. 2-3, in der *„Sachhälfte“*, in vv. 4-6, durchaus *aufgegriffen* wird, und zwar so, dass, verkürzt ausgedrückt, „Mann“ und „anderer Mann“ mit Christi Tod und mit seiner Auferweckung²⁸ verknüpft werden, und für die Christus-Gläubigen soll damit

²³ Vgl. dazu z.B. ZELLER, *Römer*, 131.

²⁴ Vgl. GIENIUSZ, „Rom 7,1-6“, 390-391.

²⁵ Vgl. dazu etwa M. BACHMANN, „Paulus“, *Der Neue Pauly*. Suppl. 8 (2013) 735-750, 735, und E.W. STEGEMANN, „P. [d.h.: Paulus], der Apostel“, *Der Neue Pauly* 9 (2000) 432-439, 433 (der hier den Gegenbegriff „Deuteropaulinen“ benutzt).

²⁶ So die Übersetzung der Zürcher Bibel von 1931.

²⁷ Vgl. GIENIUSZ, „Rom 7,1-6“, 398-399.

²⁸ Eben eine solche Akzentuierung kommt bei G. BALTES, *Paulus — Jude mit Mission*. *Alter Glaube in einer veränderten Kultur* (Marburg an der Lahn 2016) 190-195, bes. 194 (vgl. auch DERS., „Freiheit vom Gesetz“, 275-281), nicht wirklich in den Blick.

zugleich die Überwindung von Negativem und die Möglichkeit von Positivem verbunden sein. Darauf deutet etwa hin, dass in vv. 5-6 der Terminus σὰρξ, „Fleisch“, mit dem „Tod“ verknüpft wird (s. auch 6,6a: „unser [!] *alter* Mensch“ [vgl. dazu 7,22, wo dann indes vom „*inwendigen* Menschen“ gesprochen wird ²⁹]), während jetzt offenkundig ein δουλεύειν [...] ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος am Platze wäre (s. 7,6b). Ehe auf solche Kontrastierungen genauer einzugehen seien wird, sollen indes noch zwei sich angesichts der „Sachhälfte“ aufdrängende Fragen zumindest knapp bedacht werden, nämlich: Inwiefern wird hier das Bild-Moment der „Frau“ bzw. „Ehefrau“ aufgegriffen? Und: Wieso taucht in v. 4 auf einmal „Gott“ auf — dem gegenüber nun so etwas wie ein καρποφορεῖν möglich sein soll —?

Im Blick auf die erste dieser Fragen ist immerhin schon deutlich geworden, dass die in vv. 4-6 mit der Sprachform der zweiten bzw. dritten Person Plural gemeinten Christus-Gläubigen sozusagen als Partner des sterbenden und des auferweckten Christus zu begreifen sein werden — und insofern das Bild der *Ehefrau* widerspiegeln ³⁰. Dass dabei „die Wendung τὸ σῶμα τοῦ χριστοῦ ekklesiologisch verstanden werden“ müsse, wie K. Wengst meint ³¹, drängt sich indes nicht wirklich auf ³². Zwar lässt sich nicht bestreiten: „In 1Kor 12,12.27 ist [bei σῶμα] die ekklesiologische Dimension deutlich“ ³³, entsprechend natürlich auch in Röm 12,(4-).5. Aber das bedeutet schwerlich, dass bei der in Röm 7,4 verwandten Rede-weise vom „Leib Christi“ eben die in 7,4(-6) bedachten Christus-Gläubigen als „Leib Christi“ verstanden würden. Das müsste sonst doch wohl eigens gesagt werden — nicht anders als z.B. in 1Kor 12,27 (und ähnlich auch in Röm 12,4-5; 1Kor 12,12), wo es ja heißt: „Ihr aber seid der Leib Christi, als Teile betrachtet, Glieder“ ³⁴ —. In Röm 7,4(-6) dürfte demnach jene

²⁹ Insofern werden auch „anthropologische“ Termini für beide Seiten der zweiteiligen „Sachhälfte“ verwandt (wie es entsprechend bei der „Bildhälfte“ von 7,2-3 mit dem Wort ἀνὴρ der Fall ist). Auch (μέλος bzw.) μέλη (s. bes. 6,13.19; 7,23) ist dafür ein Beispiel (vgl. im Übrigen σῶμα [s. bes. 6,12; 7,4]).

³⁰ Von daher liegt ein Eindruck nahe, wie ihn HAACKER, *Römer*, 169 (samt Anm. 16), zur Sprache bringt: „Ekklesiologisch liegt der Text auf der Linie der Metaphorik von Braut und Bräutigam (vgl. Joh. 3,29; 2.Kor 11,2; Eph. 5,22-33; Offb. 19,7.9; 21,2.9; 22,17)“. Aber explizit kommt das in Röm 7,4-6 doch schwerlich zum Ausdruck.

³¹ WENGST, *Gang durch den Römerbrief*, 250.

³² Richtig m.E. insofern die (von WENGST, *Gang durch den Römerbrief*, 250, kritisierte) Formulierung von und bei HAACKER, *Römer*, 169: „Daß die Glaubenden ‚durch den Leib des Christus‘ dem Gesetz gegenüber gestorben sind, hat nichts mit der Bezeichnung der Kirche als ‚Leib Christi‘ zu tun, sondern steht verkürzt für die Hingabe des Lebens in den Tod“. Vgl. etwa DUNN, *Romans 1-8*, 361.

³³ WENGST, *Gang durch den Römerbrief*, 250.

³⁴ So die Übersetzung der Zürcher Bibel von 1931. Vgl. dazu BAUER, *Wörterbuch*, 1024-1026 (Art. μέρος), 1025.

Gruppe der Christus-Gläubigen zwar mit dem sterbenden Christus, nämlich mit dem „Leib Christi“ zusammengebracht werden, angesichts der Formulierung von 7,24 („dieser Leib des Todes“) vielleicht sogar mit dem eben als dem Tod verfallen zu begreifenden „Leib Christi“, aber nicht als sein σῶμα aufgefasst sein (und auch nicht [im Sinne von Apk 19,7] als „seine [nämlich: des Lammes, des Widderlammes] Frau“ [vgl. Apk 21,2.9; 22,17]).

Auch die andere Frage ist interessant, warum nämlich in 7,4(-6) von *Gott* — genauer vom καρποφορεῖν „für Gott“³⁵ — gesprochen wird, obwohl es hier doch, wie zu beobachten war, gerade auch um die Verbindung der Gläubigen mit Tod und Auferweckung *Christi* geht. Ein erstes Moment einer Antwort ergibt sich aus dem bereits thematisierten Bezug der Aussagen von vv. 4-6 auf Taufe und Christusevangelium. In dem Wortlaut, mit welchem dieses in 1Kor 15,3b-5 begegnet, wird die passivische Form ἐγήγερται (von v. 4b) ja „wohl als theologisches Passiv zu verstehen“³⁶ sein. Insofern ist hier wahrscheinlich Gott als der Handelnde zu begreifen. Sein Agieren in diesem Heilsgeschehen (vgl. 1Kor 15,4b [„am dritten Tag nach den Schriften“], auch v. 3b [„für unsere Sünden nach den Schriften“]) passt gut dazu, dass der von ihm dabei, wie es scheint, intendierte positive Effekt sich dann auch auf ihn selbst hin auswirken kann und sich deshalb als καρποφορεῖν „für Gott“ beschreiben lässt. Der rückwärtige Kontext von Röm 7,1/4-6, zumal das vorangehende Kapitel, stützt eine derartige Einschätzung zudem noch ganz erheblich ab. Die da gegen Ende, in 6,22 (vgl. auch v. 23), gebrauchte Formulierung, welche es mit den Adressatinnen und den Adressaten als „nun [...] von der Sünde Befreiten und Gott [τῷ θεῷ] Dienenden“ zu tun hat, bietet sogar das Wort καρπός, „Frucht“. Die in 6,10.11.13b.13c.17 vorangehenden θεός-Belege kommen bestätigend hinzu, und zwar schon insofern, als in v(v). 17(-18) an Gott als den hinsichtlich der Gläubigen positiv Handelnden gedacht ist. Zudem und vor allem ist von einiger Relevanz, dass in v. 11 (vgl. v. 10) und in v. 13b (vgl. v. 13c) eben so etwas wie „für Gott [τῷ θεῷ] leben“ als bei ihnen möglich gewordene Option benannt wird³⁷.

³⁵ So übersetzt ZELLER, *Römer*, 131, den auf καρποφορήσωμεν folgenden Dativ, nämlich τῷ θεῷ.

³⁶ D. ZELLER, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther* (KEK 5; Göttingen 2010) 464 Anm. 48.

³⁷ Vgl. GIENIUSZ, „Rom 7,1-6“, 398. Jenseits von Römer 6–7 findet sich Ähnliches nicht zuletzt in Gal 2,19(-20). Vgl. z.B. WOLTER, *Römer 1*, 415, ferner J.A. LINEBAUGH, „The Speech of the Dead: Identifying the No Longer and Now Living ‚I‘ of Galatians 2.20“, *NTS* 66 (2020) 87-105, bes. 105.

V. ETHISCHE KONSEQUENZEN

Dass in 7,4c positiv vom καρποφορεῖν „für Gott“ die Rede ist, wird nicht zuletzt auf Ethisches zu beziehen sein. Darauf dürfte gerade auch das dieser Wendung und ähnlichen Formulierungen gegenübergestellte Negative hindeuten. Für v. 4c ist da zumal dies relevant, was in v. 5 zum Sein ἐν τῇ σαρκί gesagt wird und auch zu den „den Sünden eignen Leidenschaften, die durch das Gesetz erregt wurden, wirksam in unseren Gliedern, um dem Tode Frucht zu bringen [εἰς τὸ καρποφορῆσαι τῷ θανάτῳ]“³⁸. Der Plural „Sünden“ meint ja fraglos eben ein als falsch eingeschätztes *Verhalten* — weshalb man beim καρποφορεῖν τῷ θεῷ von v. 4c doch wohl an so etwas wie ein als gut erachtetes *Handeln* zu denken hat. Entsprechende Kontrastierungen bestimmen den Passus 7,1-6 auch sonst nicht unerheblich, so in v. 3 und in v. 6 (vgl. überdies vv. 4a, 4b), ferner auch das vorangehende Kapitel (wo das ja zumal bei 6,3-4.6-7.11.12-14.16-18.19.20-22 ganz unübersehbar ist). Was dabei als zumindest prinzipiell überwunden gilt, soll uns — im Augenblick³⁹ — nicht intensiver beschäftigen. Aber dies, dass die Verbindung mit Christus, mit dem Auf-erstandenen, nach Paulus ethische Konsequenzen haben sollte, ist hier doch immerhin knapp anzudeuten.

Die in 7,6b begegnende und bereits mehrfach angesprochene Wendung vom δουλεύειν „in der Neuheit des Geistes“ wird in diesem Vers, wie ebenfalls schon berührt, von Formulierungen gerahmt, die es mit weniger Erfreulichem zu tun haben. In v. 6a geht es um etwas, „worin wir festgehalten waren“, und dabei ist fraglos auch an das Gesetz und die (gemäß v. 5) mit ihm verbundenen „Sünden“ und „Leidenschaften“ zu denken. Außerdem ist in v. 6c von der παλαιότητι γράμματος die Rede. Das erinnert natürlich gerade auch an die übrigen γράμμα -Belege des Römerbriefs⁴⁰ — also an 2,27.29 und 6,6 —, die und deren Kontexte es u.a. mit der positiv gewerteten „Beschneidung des Herzens im Geist und nicht im Buchstaben“ zu tun haben (2,29), zudem mit dem „Gesetz“ (s. 2,25-27; 6,14f.) und mit der „Sünde“ (s. bes. 6,6-7; vgl. 2,21-24.27). In 6,6 wird dabei vom prinzipiellen Ende eines δουλεύειν [...] τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ gesprochen, und eben darauf läuft dann doch wohl auch die in 7,6 verwandte Redeweise vom δουλεύειν „in der Neuheit des Geistes“ hinaus.

³⁸ So die Zürcher Bibel von 1931. Vgl. LIETZMANN, *Römer*, 73, und BERGMEIER, „Gesetz im Römerbrief“, (68-)69 (die hier von „Tatsünden“ sprechen; anders indes: W. SCHMITHALS, *Der Römerbrief*. Ein Kommentar [Gütersloh 1988] 205).

³⁹ Vgl. indes unten VI.

⁴⁰ Auch die Wendung „der alte [παλαιός] Mensch“ von 6,6 lässt sich vergleichen (s. etwa WRIGHT, *Climax of the Covenant*, 196), dort inhaltlich verbunden mit τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας.

In 6,18 heißt es überdies ähnlich — nun mit δουλοῦν, einem anderen Verb der Wortfamilie, ausgedrückt —, die Adressatinnen und Adressaten seien „der Gerechtigkeit dienstbar geworden“⁴¹. Und entsprechend kommt es in 6,17 zu einer Verknüpfung des Substantivs δοῦλος mit dem Wort δικαιοσύνη, in v. 19 ganz analog zudem auch noch des Adjektivs δοῦλος eben mit „Gerechtigkeit“. Ohnehin kann man im Blick auf „Röm 6“ von der „Verwendung der Gerechtigkeit-Terminologie im Zusammenhang [...] der Begründung der Ethik“ sprechen⁴². Kurz: Paulus bringt in 7,1-6 und auch davor, zumal im unmittelbar vorangehenden Kapitel, zum Ausdruck, dass der neue Status der Gläubigen es auch mit deutlichen ethischen Konsequenzen zu tun habe — Konsequenzen ihrer nicht zuletzt mit der Taufe vollzogenen Verbindung mit Christus.

VI. ABSCHAFFUNG DES GESETZES?

Hinsichtlich der gegen Beginn des vorliegenden Papiers angesprochenen, sich aufgrund der Rezeptions- und Auslegungsgeschichte ergebenden Frage, ob es in Röm 7,1-6 um die Abschaffung des Gesetzes gehe oder nicht, sind die soeben zusammengestellten Beobachtungen fraglos von Bedeutung. Sie lassen ja erkennen, dass Paulus hier sehr wohl an einer positiven ethischen Bilanz liegt, jedenfalls bei den angesprochenen Christus-Gläubigen. Andere Indizien weisen, wie — in der gebotenen Kürze — skizziert sei, in die gleiche Richtung.

Zunächst soll in diesem Zusammenhang ein weiterer Blick auf die in 7,4-6 begegnenden Kontrapolitionen geworfen werden. Hinsichtlich der Negativ-Folie, die dem καρποφορεῖν „für Gott“ (v. 4) und dem δουλεύειν „in der Neuheit des Geistes“ (v. 6) gegenübergestellt wird, können, wie schon vermerkt, etwa die Termini „Sünden“ (überdies auch: „Sünde“), „Gesetz“ und „Tod“ verwandt werden. Dass es dabei nicht bloß um Abstraktes, sondern auch um ziemlich Konkretes geht, wird noch deutlicher, wenn man registriert, dass im rückwärtigen Kontext insbesondere „Dinge, deren ihr euch nun schämt“ (6,21), angesprochen werden, ferner von ἀκαθαρσία (6,19), von „Unreinheit“, die Rede ist. Möglicherweise noch bemerkenswerter ist, dass es neben eben diesem Wort, ja, parallel zu ihm, (zweimal) ἀνομία, „Gesetzlosigkeit“, heißt. So heikel die Rolle des (oder eines) Gesetzes (zumal) gemäß 7,5 auch sein mag (durch das hiernach die „den Sünden eignen Leidenschaften“ ja „erregt wurden“),

⁴¹ So die Zürcher Bibel von 1931.

⁴² K. GRÜNVALDT, Art. δικαιοσύνη, *BLNT*² (1997) 729-739, 737.

so deutet sich mit diesen ἀνομία-Belegen von 6,19 doch an, dass sehr wohl doch ein Gesetz — möglicherweise sogar das mosaische Gesetz — als weiterhin anerkannter Maßstab gilt.

Von daher liegt es nahe, nun auch die drei Formulierungen von 7,1-6 etwas genauer zu betrachten, die es sprachlich gerade mit so etwas wie *Freiheit bzw. Befreiung vom Gesetz* zu tun haben⁴³ und dabei durchweg die Wendung ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου aufweisen (zu der im ersteren Fall noch τοῦ ἀνδρός hinzutritt). Von ihnen, die in 7,2b.3b.6a begegnen, gehört lediglich die dritte, welche, nicht anders als die erste, zuvor das Verb καταργεῖν bietet, der „Sachhälfte“ des Passus an, während die beiden anderen der „Bildhälfte“ zuzuordnen sind. Dabei wird in v. 2b (wie soeben bereits notiert) genauer vom „Gesetz *des Mannes*“ gesprochen, und in v. 3b wird, wenn man so will, statt καταργεῖν⁴⁴ das Adjektiv ἐλευθέρα (bzw. ἐλεύθερος), „frei“, verwandt.

Man wird darum, streng genommen, zu sagen haben, dass „die Formel ‚frei vom Gesetz‘ (ἐλευθέρος/α ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου)“ innerhalb von 7,1-6 lediglich in v. 3b vorkommt; ja, es gilt sogar, dass sie „sich im gesamten Corpus Paulinum so nur ein einziges Mal findet, nämlich in Röm 7,3“⁴⁵. Und hier begegnet sie eben „im Rahmen eines Bildwortes“⁴⁶. Sie meint da nicht die Abschaffung eines jeden „Gesetzes des Mannes“ (vgl. v. 2b) — oder gar die allgemeine Abschaffung „des Gesetzes“ (vgl. vv. 3b, 6a) —⁴⁷. Denn auch für die Zeit nach dem Tod des Ehemanns ([zumah] von vv. 2a, 3a) stellt sich nach v. 3c die von so etwas wie einer Ehe-Regel her zu klärende, die also *gesetzlich* entscheidbare Frage, wie es sich in der neuen Phase mit einer Einschätzung, einer Einordnung der *nun* eine eheliche/sexuelle Verbindung eingehenden Frau verhalten mag. Das lässt ja der hier — nach v. 3a — noch ein weiteres Mal gebrauchte Terminus μοιχαλὶς, „Ehebrecherin“, unschwer erkennen.

Es drängt sich auch darum die Frage auf, ob es bei dem der „Sachhälfte“ zugehörenden Beleg für die Verbindung von καταργεῖν und ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, also bei 7,6a, wirklich um eine prinzipielle Befreiung vom Gesetz gehen werde und nicht vielmehr um ein Entkommen aus dem Unheilszusammenhang, in den der νόμος z.B. gemäß v. 5 bei den Adressatinnen

⁴³ Vgl. dazu etwa BALTES, *Paulus*, 189-193.

⁴⁴ ZELLER, *Römer*, 130, übersetzt in 7,2b u.a. dieses Verb folgendermaßen: „hat sie mit dem Gesetz des Mannes nichts mehr zu tun“. Ganz ähnlich gibt er dann (131) auch die entsprechende Wendung von 7,6a wieder.

⁴⁵ BALTES, „Freiheit vom Gesetz“, 272. Vgl. W. COPPINS, *The Interpretation of Freedom in the Letters of Paul* (WUNT 261; Tübingen 2009) 128.

⁴⁶ BALTES, „Freiheit vom Gesetz“, 272. Vgl. VOLLENWEIDER, *Freiheit als neue Schöpfung*, 345.

⁴⁷ Vgl. BALTES, „Freiheit vom Gesetz“, 273(-275), ferner WILCKENS, *Römer* 2, 74, und LICHTENBERGER, *Das Ich Adams*, 116-117.

und Adressaten ja *vor* ihrer Taufe irgendwie verstrickt war⁴⁸. Die παλαιότης γράμματος von v. 6b wäre dann mit „unserem alten Menschen“ (6,6a) zu verbinden, und das (ebenfalls in 6,6a angesprochene) Mitgekreuzigtsein hätte es entsprechend mit dem Sterben von 7,6a zu tun, das sich eben auf dasjenige bezieht, „in dem wir [bis dahin] niedergehalten wurden“⁴⁹. Der mittlerweile (gerade auch aufgrund der Taufe) möglich gewordene Modus eines δουλεύειν „in der Neuheit des Geistes“ signalisierte insofern zwar die Überwindung jenes Unheilszusammenhangs, bedeutete jedoch keineswegs einen grundsätzlichen Bruch mit dem Gesetz.

Eine solche Sicht wird durch den Kontext sehr nachdrücklich gestützt. In 6,14 (vgl. v. 15) ist ja, genau besehen, nicht vom Ende des νόμος die Rede, sondern von einer nun jedenfalls grundsätzlich überwundenen Phase, in der man „unter dem Gesetz war“, und das Signum ὑπὸ νόμον ist hiernach durch ein anderes abgelöst worden, durch ὑπὸ χάριν, „unter der Gnade“. In 8,2 wird dann zudem bemerkenswerterweise gerade auch im Blick auf die neue Phase eben der Terminus νόμος gebraucht⁵⁰, heißt es hier doch: ὁ (γὰρ) νόμος [!] τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς! Nun, ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, sei man „freigemacht vom Gesetz der Sünde und des Todes“.

Dieses Nebeneinander von „Gesetz der Sünde und des Todes“ und von „Gesetz des Geistes des Lebens“ passt bestens zu dem im Vorangehenden an dem Passus 7,1-6 Beobachteten, und ähnlich fügen sich dazu auch die Worte von 8,4, es möge jetzt „die Rechtsforderung des Gesetzes [!] erfüllt“ werden, und zwar in einem περιπατεῖν „nicht nach dem Fleisch [...], sondern nach dem Geist“⁵¹. Paulus ist hier, wie wir zu konstatieren hatten, sehr wohl am Ethos der Gläubigen interessiert (s. V.). Das entspricht sowohl der Ehe-Regel als auch der mit diesem Bild verdeutlichten Verbindung der Adressatinnen und Adressaten eben mit Christus, mit dessen Tod und mit dessen Auferweckung (s. III. und IV.), zumal die auffälligen Ambiguitäten des Abschnitts es nicht zuletzt mit dem Gesetz zu tun haben, und zwar offenkundig mit dem — den Angesprochenen, v. 1a zufolge, nicht unbekannten — mosaischen Gesetz (s. II.). Als Resultat

⁴⁸ S. nochmals BERGMIEIER, „Gesetz im Römerbrief“, 68-69. Vgl. M. BACHMANN, „Paul, Israel and the Gentiles: Hermeneutical and Exegetical Notes“, in *Paul and Judaism. Crosscurrents in Pauline Exegesis and the Study of Jewish-Christian Relations* (hg.v. R. BIERINGER – D. POLLEFEYT) (Library of New Testament Studies 463; London – New York 2012) 72-105, bes. 93-103.

⁴⁹ ZELLER, *Römer*, 131.

⁵⁰ Vgl. etwa BALTES, „Freiheit vom Gesetz“, bes. 281-283.

⁵¹ So (jeweils) ZELLER, *Römer*, 148. Vgl. etwa: FINSTERBUSCH, *Thora als Lebensweisung*, 49; M. MÜLLER, „Jesus und das Gesetz. Eine Skizze im Licht der Rezeptionen“, *KuD* 50 (2005) 208-225, 209-211; M. MEISER, „Das Verhältnis zur Tora“, *Paulus Handbuch* (hg.v. F.W. HORN) (Tübingen 2013) 444-449, 448.

wird darum im Hinblick auf den eingangs charakterisierten exegetischen Dissens (s. I.) festzuhalten sein: Der Apostel denkt in 7,1-6 durchaus *nicht* an eine Abschaffung der Tora. Es geht ihm *nicht* um „Gesetzlosigkeit“⁵². Vielmehr liegt ihm gerade auch an so etwas wie christlicher Ethik, an einem καρποφορεῖν „für Gott“ (v. 4c)⁵³.

Universität Siegen
Adolf-Reichwein Str. 2
D-57068 Siegen

Michael BACHMANN

SUMMARY

Rom 7,1-6 is much disputed, especially the meaning of “law”. Should it be understood as law in general or as “Torah”? Is it esteemed as abolished by Christ? What about “freedom from law” (see v. 3)? The exegetical disagreements (I.), the ambiguities of the passage (II.) and its structure (III.) are considered. The passage connects a marriage-rule with the relationship(s) of the addressees to the dying and resurrected Christ — within an ethical perspective (IV., V.). Result: It is thought of as Torah, which means that the ethical content of the law has not been given up on the basis of the Christ-event (VI.).

⁵² Vgl. oben (bei) Anm. 2, zudem M. BACHMANN, „Christus, ‚das Ende des Gesetzes, des Dekalogs und des Liebesgebots‘?“, in DERS., *Von Paulus zur Apokalypse — und weiter*. Exegetische und rezeptionsgeschichtliche Studien zum Neuen Testament (samt englischsprachigen *summaries*) (NTOA/StUNT 91; Göttingen – Oakville, CT 2011) 181-184 (zuerst: 2007), ferner DERS., „Paul, Israel and the Gentiles“, 94, überdies auch DERS., „The Anti-Judaic Moment in the ‚Pauline‘ Doctrine of Justification: A (Protestant) Misinterpretation of the Relevant Statements in Paul’s Letters“, in *The Message of Paul the Apostle within Second Temple Judaism* (Hg.v. F. ÁBEL) (Lanham, MD – London 2020) 21-59, 38. Hier heißt es: „The largely positive Pauline statements on *nomos* no longer need to be relativized in some way, but instead must be taken seriously“ (s. z.B. Röm 7,12). Es sei insbesondere auch das über lange Zeit hin (zumal im Protestantismus) übliche Verständnis des Ausdrucks ἔργα νόμου, „Werke des Gesetzes“, im Sinne von (scheinbar) guten Werken (s. z.B. SCHMITHALS, *Römerbrief*, 204) zu kritisieren: „The anti-Judaic moment in the ‚Pauline‘ doctrine of justification must now [...] be judged as a (Protestant) *misinterpretation* of the relevant statements in Paul’s letters“.

⁵³ Vgl. GIENIUSZ, „Rom 7,1-6“, bes. 400 (der mit Blick auf Röm 7,1-6 von „the strong refusal of libertinism and licentious conduct in the new situation of being a Christian“ spricht, indes auch formuliert: „Freedom from the law is but one of its characteristics“, etwas später jedoch betont, es sei hier „freedom of the law [...] not the point of [...] demonstration“), ferner etwa LIETZMANN, *Römer*, 73, und WOLTER, *Römer I*, 416(-417).

ONE DAY LIKE A THOUSAND YEARS (2 PET 3,8)

Psalms 90 contrasts God's eternity with the limited lifespan of humans and asks God to turn away wrath so that an entire human lifetime is not spent under wrath. The most extravagant expression of God's eternity is v. 2: "from everlasting to everlasting you are God" (ומעולם ועד עולם אל). The most extravagant expression of the limited human lifespan is the comparison of it to grass in vv. 5-6: "in the morning it flourishes and is renewed; in the evening it fades and withers". A less extravagant expression of this is found in v. 10: "the days of our life are seventy years, or perhaps eighty, if we are strong". A less extravagant expression of God's eternity is v. 4: "For a thousand years in your sight are like yesterday when it is past, or like a watch in the night" (כאלף שנים בעיניך כיום אתמול כי יעבר) (ואשמורה בלילה). In the psalm itself v. 4 is one way of expressing the contrast between the lengths of time God and humans exist; it is not intended to set up a simple equivalence between a thousand human years and one divine day. However, this is the meaning that was often extracted from it.

I. JEWISH USE OF Ps 90,4

Some Jewish authors understood Ps 90,4 as originally meant, to express a contrast between the lengths of time God and humans exist. Richard J. Bauckham suggests that this is the case in Sir 18,9-11; 2 *Apoc. Bar.* 48.12-13; and *L.A.B.* 19.13a¹. Most Jewish authors viewed Ps 90,4 as implying the equivalence of a thousand human years and one divine day. They used this understanding of Ps 90,4 to make at least four different arguments:

- 1) to argue that Adam died on the same day he ate the fruit of the tree, as was predicted in Gen 2,17;
- 2) to argue that the history of the world consists of one-thousand-year days corresponding to the seven days of creation in Gen 1,1 – 2,3;
- 3) to argue that the day of the Lord or the day of the Messiah lasts one thousand years;
- 4) to argue that the Torah preceded the creation of the world by two thousand years.

¹ R.J. BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter* (WBC 50; Waco, TX 1983) 308-309.

1) The earliest known use of this understanding of Ps 90,4 is *Jub.* 4.30. *Jubilees* uses the passage to make the first of the four arguments.

And he [Adam] lacked seventy years of one thousand years; for one thousand years are as one day in the testimony of the heavens and therefore was it written concerning the tree of knowledge: “On the day that ye eat thereof ye shall die” [Gen 2,17]. For this reason he did not complete the years of this day; for he died during it (*APOT* 2.19).

Here Ps 90,4, “the testimony of the heavens”, is used to explain that Adam’s death at age 930 did not falsify Gen 2,17. Since a thousand years are as one day, Adam’s death before he reached the age of a thousand years was a death on the day that he ate from the tree. This interpretation is also found in *Midr. Tehillim* 25.8, *Gen. Rab.* 19.8, 22.1 and *Num. Rab.* 5.4, but without an equally clear reference to Ps 90,4.

2) Use of Ps 90,4 to make the second argument, namely that world history consists of a number of one-thousand-year days, is found in *b. Sanh.* 97a ².

R. Kattina said: Six thousand years shall the world exist, and one [thousand, the seventh], it shall be desolate, as it is written, And the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day [Isa 2,11]. Abaye said: it will be desolate two [thousand], as it is said, After two days will he revive us: in the third day, he will raise us up, and we shall live in his sight [Hos 6,2].

It has been taught in accordance with R. Kattina: Just as the seventh year is one year of release in seven, so is the world: one thousand years out of seven shall be fallow, as it is written, And the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day, and it is further said, A Psalm and song for the Sabbath day [Ps 92,1], meaning the day that is altogether Sabbath — and it is also said, For a thousand years in thy sight are but as yesterday when it is past [Ps 90,4] ³.

Here Ps 90,4 is used to support the interpretation of “day” in Isa 2,11, Hos 6,2 and Ps 92,1 as meaning a thousand years. There is no explicit reference to the days of creation, but there are references to the sabbatical year (Deut 15,1-18; cf. Exod 21,1-11; Lev 25,1-7) and to the sabbath day, both of which are related to the seven days of creation.

Second (Slavonic) Enoch 33 speaks of the world existing for seven thousand years after which is the eighth thousand. These one-thousand-year periods are also called days, referring to the days of creation. There

² Translations of the Babylonian Talmud are taken from *The Babylonian Talmud*, 34 vols. in 6 parts (ed. I. EPSTEIN) (London 1935-1952).

³ There is a shorter version of this tradition in *b. Rosh ha-Sh.* 31a that reports only the views of R. Kattina and Abaye and not the remainder of this passage. Consequently it does not contain the citation of Ps 90,4.

is no explicit reference to Ps 90,4, but it probably lies behind the equation of a day with a thousand years. Somewhat similarly *Pirke R. El.* 18 says:

The Holy One, blessed be he, created seven ages (עולמות) and of them all chose only the seventh; six are for going and coming, and one is entirely sabbath and rest for life everlasting (שכולו שבת ומנוחה לחיי העולם) ⁴.

And in *b. Sanh.* 97a-b we find the following:

The Tanna debe Eliyyahu teaches: The world is to exist six thousand years. In the first two thousand there was desolation; two thousand years the Torah flourished; and the next two thousand years is the Messianic era but through our many iniquities all these years have been lost.

Here there is neither reference to Ps 90,4 nor to the days of creation, but both are probably presupposed. This same tradition is found in *b. Abod. Zar.* 9a ⁵.

3) Use of Ps 90,4 to make the third argument, namely that the day of the Messiah would last a thousand years, is found in *Pesiq. Rabbati* 1.

How long do the days of the Messiah last? [...] Rabbi Eliezer ben Jose the Galilean said: one thousand years, as it says: “For a thousand years in your sight are like yesterday” (Ps 90,4).

Here Ps 90,4 is used to support the interpretation of “day” in the phrase “days of the Messiah” as meaning a thousand years. This same tradition is also found in *Midr. Tehillim* 90.17.

4) Use of Ps 90,4 to make the fourth argument, namely that the Torah preceded creation by two thousand years, is found in *Gen. Rab.* 8.2.

The Torah [...] preceded the creation of the world by two thousand years, as it is written, *Then I* [sc. the Torah] *was by Him, as a nursling, and I was His delight day after day* (Prov VIII, 30); now the day of the Lord is a thousand years [וימו של הקדוש ברוך הוא אלף שנים], as it is said, *For a thousand years in your sight are but as yesterday when it is past* (Ps XC, 4) ⁶.

Here Ps 90,4 is used to interpret the meaning of “day” in Prov 8,30. The verse says that the one speaking, understood to be the Torah, was with God for at least two days (“day after day”), days that preceded God’s creation of the world. These two days are understood to be two thousand years. This same tradition is also found in *Lev. Rab.* 19.1 and *Cant. Rab.* 5.11.

⁴ Cf. the reference in *Pirke R. El.* 28 to the “day of the Holy One” as a period of time encompassing the rule of four kingdoms.

⁵ According to K.G.C. NEWPORT (*Apocalypse and Millennium*. Studies in Biblical Eisege-sis [Cambridge 2000] 51), W. Whiston (1667-1752) made use of this tradition.

⁶ *Midrash Rabbah*. Translated into English with Notes, Glossary and Indices, 10 vols. (ed. H. FREEDMAN – M. SIMON) (London 1939) 1:56.

II. CHRISTIAN CONTINUATION OF JEWISH USE OF Ps 90,4

Christian writers such as Victorinus of Petau (250-303), Methodius (d. c. 311) and Lactantius (c. 250-325) use Ps 90,4 to make the second of the arguments made by Jewish authors, namely that world history consists of a number of one-thousand-year days. In *On the Creation of the World* 6 Victorinus says:

[T]hat true and just Sabbath should be observed in the seventh millenary of years. Wherefore to those seven days the Lord attributed to each a thousand years; for thus went the warning: "In Thine eyes, O Lord, a thousand years are as one day" [Ps 90,4] [...] Wherefore, as I have narrated, that true Sabbath will be in the seventh millenary of years, when Christ with His elect shall reign (ANF 7.342).

In *On the Creatures* 9 Methodius says:

But if any one should prefer to differ in these points, let him first say, whether a period of time be not easily reckoned from the creation of the world, according to the Book of Moses, to those who so receive it, the voice of prophecy here proclaiming: "Thou art God from everlasting, and world without end [...] For a thousand years in Thy sight are but as yesterday: seeing that it is past as a watch in the night" [Ps 90,2.4]. For when a thousand years are reckoned as one day in the sight of God, and from the creation of the world to His rest is six days, so also to our time, six days are defined, as those say who are clever arithmeticians. Therefore, they say that an age of six thousand years extends from Adam to our time. For they say that the judgment will come on the seventh day, that is in the seventh thousand years (ANF 6.381).

Since a thousand years are like one day for God, the seven days of creation constitute seven thousand years. Methodius is here quoting Origen who uses these reflections as part of an argument for the eternity of the universe. Likewise Lactantius says in *Divine Institutes* 7.14:

Therefore, since all the works of God were completed in six days, the world must continue in its present state through six ages, that is, six thousand years. For the great day of God is limited by a circle of a thousand years, as the prophet shows, who says, "For a thousand years in your sight are like one day" [Ps 90,4]. And as God labored during those six days in creating such great works, so His religion and truth must labor during these six thousand years, while wickedness prevails and bears rule. And again, since God, having finished His works, rested the seventh day and blessed it, at the end of the six thousandth year all wickedness must be abolished from the earth, and righteousness reign for a thousand years; and there must be tranquility and rest from the labors which the world now has long endured (ANF 7.211).

III. USE OF PS 90,4 BY THE SECOND LETTER OF PETER

The author of 2 Peter uses Ps 90,4 rather differently. In 3,8 the author of 2 Peter gives a second response to the scoffing question reported in 3,4: “Where is the promise of his [Jesus’] coming?” The response addresses the perception that the second coming of Jesus has not happened as soon as it should have. The author reminds the addressees that “with the Lord one day is like a thousand years and a thousand years are like one day” (ὅτι μία ἡμέρα παρὰ κυρίῳ ὥς χίλια ἔτη καὶ χίλια ἔτη ὥς ἡμέρα μία).

The final clause of 2 Pet 3,8 (χίλια ἔτη ὥς ἡμέρα μία) derives from the Greek translation of Ps 90,4 (χίλια ἔτη ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς σου ὥς ἡ ἡμέρα), omitting ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς σου both because the equivalent παρὰ κυρίῳ has already been used in the previous clause of the sentence, and because ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς σου suits the psalm’s statement addressed to God but not the statement about God into which the author of 2 Peter has converted it. Second Peter also omits the article with ἡμέρα and adds μία. The first clause of the sentence (μία ἡμέρα παρὰ κυρίῳ ὥς χίλια ἔτη) is the author of 2 Peter’s expansion of the quotation from Ps 90,4.

Since Ps 90,4 says that a long time for humans is a short time for God, the author of 2 Peter might have responded to the perception that the second coming of Jesus has been delayed by simply quoting the psalm: the second coming has not been delayed because for God a thousand human years are like one day. But instead of doing this, the author of 2 Peter has expanded the psalm quotation. Some think that this was done for rhetorical effect without changing the meaning of the psalm quotation ⁷. To me it seems clear that the expansion has added a meaning not found in the quotation itself.

The final two clauses of 2 Pet 3,8 are parallel; παρὰ κυρίῳ, which explicitly follows μία ἡμέρα in the first clause, is understood to follow χίλια ἔτη in the second. It is likely that the first perspective mentioned is the same in both clauses since there is nothing to indicate a change in perspective. In Ps 90,4 the first perspective is that of humans: a thousand human years is like one divine day. The parallel between the expansion of the psalm verse in 2 Pet 3,8 and the verse itself means that the first perspective of the expansion is also that of humans: one human day is like a thousand divine years.

⁷ BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 310; cf. G.L. GREEN, *Jude & 2 Peter* (Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids, MI 2008) 326.

The psalm verse says that a long time for humans is a short time for God. The author's expansion of the psalm quotation makes the converse point, namely that what humans regard as a short time — one day — is like a thousand years for God. The author of 2 Peter has expanded the quotation of Ps 90,4 to say first that a short time for humans is a long time for God, then that a long time for humans is a short time for God. Thus human and divine time are completely incommensurable. No conclusions about divine time can be drawn from human time, and one cannot use the passage of time to argue that the second coming of Jesus has not happened as soon as it should have ⁸.

The expansion of Ps 90,4 and the meaning that results from the expansion seem to be the creation of the author of 2 Peter. According to Bauckham, this is the view of most commentators, but Bauckham himself views 2 Peter's expansion of Ps 90,4 as an exegetical rule derived from Ps 90,4 but existing as a relatively independent formulation. Bauckham sees this rule as cited by the Jewish texts discussed in section I above ⁹. However, only one of the texts quoted above uses a formulation comparable to 2 Pet 3,8's expansion of Ps 90,4; the others simply refer to, cite, or presuppose Ps 90,4. The exception is *Gen. Rab.* 8.2. This text restates the meaning of Ps 90,4 by saying: *ויומו של הקדוש ברוך הוא אלף שנים* ("now the day of the Holy One, blessed be he, is a thousand years"). This same formulation is also found in *Pesiq. Rabbati* 1 (three times); *Midr. Tehillim* 90.17; *Lev. Rab.* 19.1; and *Cant. Rab.* 5.11. *Num. Rab.* 5.4 speaks only of *יומו של*

⁸ For this interpretation, see T. CALLAN, *Acknowledging the Divine Benefactor*. The Second Letter of Peter (Eugene, OR 2014) 176-178. Commentators who offer a similar interpretation include: VENERABLE BEDE (c. 673-735); K.H. SCHEKLE, *Die Petrusbriefe. Der Judasbrief* (HTKNT 13/2; Freiburg 1961) 226-227; C. SPICQ, *Les Épîtres de Saint Pierre* (SB; Paris 1966) 250-251; J.N.D. KELLY, *The Epistles of Peter and of Jude* (HNTC; New York – Evanston, IL 1969) 361-362; J.H. NEYREY, *2 Peter, Jude* (AB 37C; New York 1993) 238; H. PAULSEN, *Der Zweite Petrusbrief und der Judasbrief* (Meyer Kommentar; Göttingen 1992) 163-164; O. KNOCH, *Der Erste und Zweite Petrusbrief. Der Judasbrief* (RNT; Regensburg 1990) 279-280; D.J. HARRINGTON, "Jude and 2 Peter", in D.P. SENIOR – D.J. HARRINGTON, *1 Peter, Jude and 2 Peter* (SacPag 15; Collegeville, MN 2003) 159-299, here 288; P.H. DAVIDS, *The Letters of 2 Peter and Jude* (Pillar New Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge 2006) 277. E. KÄSEMANN ("An Apologia for Primitive Christian Eschatology", in his *Essays on New Testament Themes* [trans. W.J. MONTAGUE] [SBT 41; Naperville, IL 1964] 169-195, here 193-194) presumes this interpretation and argues that it robs apocalyptic expectation of all meaning; so also H. WINDISCH, *Die Katholische Briefe* (HNT 15; Tübingen 1951) 102; W. GRUNDMANN, *Der Brief des Judas und der Zweite Brief des Petrus* (THKNT 15; Berlin 1974) 115-116; T. FORNBERG, *An Early Church in a Pluralistic Society. A Study of 2 Peter* (ConBNT series 9; Lund 1977) 68. I reject Käsemann's argument (though not his interpretation of v. 8); I regard v. 8 as a way of saying that the time of the end is unknown, a prominent theme of apocalyptic expectation.

⁹ BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 306-307.

הקדוש ברוך הוא (“the day of the Holy One, blessed be he”) but the context implies that the day is a thousand years.

This formulation has some similarity to 2 Pet 3,8 (μία ἡμέρα παρὰ κυρίῳ ὡς χίλια ἔτη, “one day with the Lord is like a thousand years”) but also differs from it in ways that make it seem unlikely that the rabbinic formulation is the source of 2 Pet 3,8. Most significantly: a) 2 Peter speaks of one day, emphasizing the contrast between one and one thousand, while the rabbinic formula speaks only of the day; b) the two use different designations for God: 2 Peter speaks of the Lord while the rabbinic formula speaks of the Holy One, blessed be he; and c) 2 Peter says one day is *like* a thousand years, while the rabbinic formula says that a day *is* a thousand years.

Other rabbinic texts restate the meaning of Ps 90,4 somewhat differently. *Gen. Rab.* 19.8 says God will give Adam **יום אחד משלי שהוא אלף שנים** (“one day of mine which is a thousand years”). An equivalent expression is found in *Gen. Rab.* 22.1 and *Midr. Tehillim* 25.8 in which someone speaks to God about giving Adam **יום אחד משלך שהוא אלף שנה** (“one day of yours which is a thousand years”). Like 2 Pet 3,8 these texts speak about one day, but otherwise they are even less like it than the other rabbinic formulation.

IV. USE OF 2 PET 3,8

Several later Christian authors seem to have taken up 2 Pet 3,8’s expansion of Ps 90,4¹⁰. The main indication that these authors rely on 2 Pet 3,8 is that their language seems to be derived from 2 Peter’s expansion of Ps 90,4. It is not impossible that this language could have been independently derived from the psalm itself rather than from 2 Peter. However, the close relationship between their words and the words of 2 Pet 3,8 makes it seem more likely that they depend on 2 Pet 3,8. Bauckham thinks that *Letter of Barnabas* 15.4, Justin, *Dialogue with Trypho* 81 and Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 15.23.2; 28.3 do not depend on 2 Pet 3,8 but rather on the Jewish exegetical rule derived from Ps 90,4 that Bauckham argues is

¹⁰ C. BIGG (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude* [ICC; New York 1901] 201, 203, 205-206, 210) also suggests that all of the passages discussed below, except the *Didascalia* passage, made use of 2 Pet 3,8. G. WOHLBERG (*Der erste und zweite Petrusbrief und der Judasbrief* [Leipzig 1915] XLV) thinks that *Letter of Barnabas* 15.4; Justin, *Dialogue with Trypho* 81 and Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 15.23.2; 28.3 quote 2 Pet 3,8. G.L. GREEN (*Jude & 2 Peter*, 142; cf. 325) thinks that *Letter of Barnabas* 15.4 and Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 15.23.2 quote 2 Pet 3,8.

the source of 2 Pet 3,8 itself ¹¹. Two of the three considerations discussed above that make Bauckham's proposal regarding the source of 2 Pet 3,8 unlikely also make his understanding of the source of later Christian texts unlikely. These texts resemble the first rabbinic formulation in omitting the reference to *one* day that is found in 2 Pet 3,8. However, like 2 Pet 3,8 they differ from the rabbinic formulation in two ways: a) using a different designation for God; and b) saying that a day is *like* a thousand years (or something similar), not that it *is* a thousand years. This makes it more likely that later Christian authors depend on 2 Pet 3,8 than that they depend on a formulation found in rabbinic literature.

If later Christian authors have taken up 2 Pet 3,8's expansion of Ps 90,4, they give 2 Pet 3,8 new meaning. In 2 Pet 3,8, as we have seen, μία ἡμέρα παρὰ κυρίῳ ὡς χίλια ἔτη means that one human day is like a thousand years for God. These later authors understand it to mean that one day for God is like a thousand human years. In other words, they understand it to mean the same thing as Ps 90,4 itself and use it in the same way that the authors we have discussed above use Ps 90,4 to argue, for various reasons, that a thousand years for humans is only one day for God ¹². They convert the first half of 2 Peter's argument for the incommensurability of divine and human time into a formula for interpreting the word "day" as it applies to God.

1) *Letter of Barnabas* (c.130?)

The earliest of these Christian authors who seem to use 2 Peter's expansion of Ps 90,4 in this way is the author of the *Letter of Barnabas*. The author uses it for the second of the reasons listed above. When *Letter of Barnabas* 15 discusses the sabbath, it first discusses the seven days of creation in Gen 1,1 – 2,3. In 15.4 the author interprets the first six days as equal to six thousand years "for with him [viz. God] a day signifies a

¹¹ BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 306-307. Cf. F.H. CHASE, "Peter, Second Epistle of", *Hastings Dictionary of the Bible* (Edinburgh 1900) 3:796-818, here 800. Note that BAUCKHAM (*Jude, 2 Peter*, 163), although he argues that the texts under discussion here do not depend on 2 Pet 3,8, sees other evidence that "2 Peter was known throughout the second century, at least in some circles, but not widely used"; cf. GREEN, *Jude & 2 Peter*, 140-144.

¹² It is not impossible that this understanding of 2 Pet 3,8 is its meaning in the context of 2 Peter. If so, the parallelism of the final two clauses of 2 Pet 3,8 means that the author of 2 Peter understood the words quoted from Ps 90,4 to mean that what is like a thousand years for God is like a day for humans, reversing their meaning in Ps 90,4. The effect of this interpretation would be the same as the one argued above, namely that divine and human time are incommensurable, but it seems less likely than the interpretation argued above, since it means that the author of 2 Peter would have misunderstood Ps 90,4. Therefore, the authors discussed in the following section who use 2 Pet 3,8 have probably not used it with its original meaning.

thousand years” (ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα παρ’ αὐτῷ σημαίνει χίλια ἔτη). It seems very likely that this is derived from 2 Pet 3,8’s expansion of its own quotation of Ps 90,4 but with several changes: a) μία has been omitted and replaced by ἡ γὰρ because the author of the *Letter of Barnabas* is not concerned with the contrast between one day and a thousand years, but rather with the meaning of the word “day”; b) κυρίῳ has been replaced by the equivalent αὐτῷ; and c) ὥς has been replaced by σημαίνει.

The *Letter of Barnabas* then supports the assertion that with God a day signifies a thousand years by saying, “And he himself bears me witness when he says, ‘Behold, the day of the Lord will be as a thousand years’” (Ἰδοὺ, ἡμέρα κυρίου ἔσται ὥς χίλια ἔτη). This might be a somewhat free quotation of 2 Pet 3,8, again with several changes: a) Ἰδοὺ has been added; b) μία has been omitted; c) παρὰ κυρίῳ has been replaced by κυρίου; and d) ἔσται has been added. If the *Letter of Barnabas* is not quoting 2 Peter, the source of the quotation is unknown. And in any case the identity of the “he” who said it is unclear.

2) Justin, *Dialogue with Trypho* (c. 160)

Another author who seems to have taken up 2 Pet 3,8’s expansion of Ps 90,4 in a similar way is Justin in his *Dialogue with Trypho*. Justin uses it for the first and third of the reasons listed above. In *Dialogue* 80 Trypho asks Justin if he believes that Jerusalem will be rebuilt and all Christ’s followers be gathered there together with him. Justin answers that he does believe this, but admits that other Christians do not. He is assured that “there will be a resurrection of the dead and a thousand years in Jerusalem which will then be built”. In section 81 Justin supports this by quoting Isa 65,17-25. Justin says that v. 22 of this passage, “according to the days of the tree of life shall be the days of my people”, obscurely predicts a thousand years. He supports this by saying that Adam was told he would die in the day that he ate of the tree (in Gen 2,17), and Adam died before reaching age one thousand. Justin then says in 81.3 that “the expression, ‘The day of the Lord is as a thousand years’ (ἡμέρα κυρίου ὥς χίλια ἔτη), is connected with this subject”. This seems to be another quotation of 2 Pet 3,8. This quotation includes two of the changes found in the *Letter of Barnabas*’s direct quotation, namely: a) μία has been omitted; and b) παρὰ κυρίῳ has been replaced by κυρίου. Justin’s quotation is closer to a verbatim quotation of 2 Pet 3,8 than that of the *Letter of Barnabas*. Justin concludes by referring to Rev 20,4.

Justin understands “day” in Gen 2,17 to mean a thousand years on the basis of 2 Pet 3,8. He also understands “the days of the tree of life” in

Isa 65,22 as a reference to this first one-thousand-year day of world history. The days of the tree of life will correspond to the days of my people; Justin understands these as the days of the Messiah with his people. Since the former are a thousand years, so also will the latter be a thousand years ¹³.

3) Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* (c. 180)

Another author who seems to have taken up 2 Pet 3,8's expansion of Ps 90,4 in a somewhat similar way is Irenaeus. In *Against Heresies* 5.23.2 Irenaeus uses it for the first of the reasons listed above. Irenaeus discusses the death of Adam, arguing that it occurred on the same day he ate the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, fulfilling Gen 2,17. Irenaeus says that this day was one of the days of creation. He observes that some "relegate the death of Adam to the thousandth year; for since 'a day of the Lord is as a thousand years' (*dies Domini sicut mille anni*), he did not overstep the thousand years but died within them". The Greek text is lacking, but the Latin seems to render the same quotation of 2 Pet 3,8's expansion of Ps 90,4 found in Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho*, namely ἡμέρα κυρίου ὡς χίλια ἔτη.

Irenaeus quotes 2 Pet 3,8's expansion of Ps 90,4 a second time in 5.28.3. Here Irenaeus uses it for the second of the purposes listed above. He discusses the days of creation and argues that the world will end after six days = six thousand years: "For the day of the Lord is as a thousand years" (ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα κυρίου ὡς ,α ἔτη). This quotation makes two changes in 2 Pet 3,8 both of them seen in other versions of the quotation: a) μία has been omitted and replaced by ἡ γάρ; and b) παρὰ κυρίῳ has been replaced by κυρίου.

4) Hippolytus, *Commentary on Daniel* (c. 204)

Yet another author who seems to have taken up 2 Pet 3,8's expansion of Ps 90,4 is Hippolytus. In his *Commentary on Daniel*, Hippolytus says:

For as the times are noted from the foundation of the world, and reckoned from Adam, they set clearly before us the matter with which our inquiry deals. For the first appearance of our Lord in the flesh took place in Bethlehem, under Augustus, in the year 5500; and He suffered in the thirty-third year. And six thousand years must needs be accomplished, in order that the Sabbath may come, the rest, the holy day "on which God rested from all His works"

¹³ It is possible that Rev 20,4 is based on the idea that the day of the Messiah is a thousand years though there is no explicit reference to this in the text of Revelation.

[Gen 2,2]. For the Sabbath is the type and emblem of the future kingdom of the saints, when they shall reign with Christ, when He comes from heaven, as John says in his Apocalypse [Rev 20,4-6]: for “a day with the Lord is as a thousand years” [ἡμέρα γὰρ κυρίου ὡς χίλια ἔτη]. Since, then, in six days God made all things, it follows that six thousand years must be fulfilled. And they are not yet fulfilled, as John says: “five are fallen; one is,” that is, the sixth; “the other is not yet come” [Rev 17,10] (ANF 5.179).

Like the *Letter of Barnabas* and Irenaeus, Hippolytus interprets the days of creation as consisting of a thousand years, for a day with the Lord is as a thousand years (ἡμέρα γὰρ κυρίου ὡς χίλια ἔτη). This quotation of 2 Pet 3,8 makes three changes: a) μία has been omitted; b) γὰρ has been inserted after ἡμέρα; and c) παρὰ κυρίῳ has been replaced by κυρίου. Like Justin, Hippolytus relates the one-thousand-year day of the Messiah to the Book of Revelation.

5) *Didascalia Apostolorum* (c. 230)

Another author who seems to have taken up 2 Pet 3,8's expansion of Ps 90,4 is the author of the *Didascalia Apostolorum*. As part of an argument against keeping most of the provisions of the Jewish law, the author argues against keeping the sabbath. One element of that argument is to reject the view that the sabbath takes precedence over the first day of the week, namely Sunday, the day observed by Christians as the Lord's day. The author argues that the first day and the last are equal and cites 2 Pet 3,8 in support of this:

The first day and the last are equal; for learn how you find it written, that in his kingdom “[t]he day of the Lord is as a thousand years: the day of yesterday which is past, and as a watch of the night” (*dies domini ut mille anni: dies hesternus qui transiit, et custodia nocturna*)¹⁴.

In the Latin translation of the *Didascalia*, “The day of the Lord is as a thousand years” is very close to the Latin translation of Irenaeus' first quotation of 2 Pet 3,8, differing from it only in having *ut* instead of *sicut*. Both seem to be renderings of the Greek text found in Justin. The author of the *Didascalia* has combined this quotation of 2 Pet 3,8 with a quotation of Ps 90,4, though not the same part of the psalm verse that 2 Peter quotes. The *Didascalia* quotes the part of the verse that says a thousand years in God's eyes are like “the day of yesterday which is past; and as a watch in the night”. And it is this that is important to the author. He makes

¹⁴ R.H. CONNOLLY, *Didascalia Apostolorum*. The Syriac Version Translated and Accompanied by the Verona Latin Fragments. With an Introduction and Notes (Oxford 1929) 234-235.

nothing of the idea that the day is like a thousand years. What is important is that the day of the Lord is like yesterday, i.e., the first day, Sunday, and the last day, the sabbath, are alike. He combines the psalm quote with the quotation of 2 Peter because only the latter speaks of the day of the Lord, not the psalm itself. Only the combination of 2 Pet 3,8's expansion of Ps 90,4 with the psalm quotation makes the comparison of the day of the Lord with yesterday that serves the author's purpose.

6) Methodius, *On the Resurrection*

We have discussed a number of Christian writers who quote 2 Pet 3,8 but use it to express a different meaning than it had for the author of 2 Peter, namely the idea that the day of the Lord is a thousand years. Other Christian authors understand 2 Pet 3,8 more in line with the author of 2 Peter's own understanding. One example of this is found in what some regard as a fragment of Methodius, *On the Resurrection*. This text comments on Rev 20,6 and argues that the thousand years of the kingdom mentioned in that verse indicate an endless age (ἀπέραντον αἰῶνα). In support of this the text cites 2 Pet 3,8: "For the apostle Peter has written, With the Lord one day is like a thousand years and a thousand years are like one day (μία ἡμέρα παρὰ κυρίῳ ὡς χίλια ἔτη καὶ χίλια ἔτη ὡς ἡμέρα μία)". The text perceives that 2 Peter is presenting the incommensurability of human and divine time and eliminating the possibility that a thousand years be understood literally. It goes beyond 2 Peter, however, in arguing that a thousand years indicate an endless age.

V. WORLD HISTORY AS CONSISTING OF ONE-THOUSAND-YEAR DAYS

In the first three centuries of Christian history, the most common use of Ps 90,4 and 2 Pet 3,8 was to understand the history of the world as consisting of one-thousand-year days corresponding to the days of creation. Victorinus, Methodius and Lactantius based this on Ps 90,4, while the *Letter of Barnabas*, Irenaeus and Hippolytus relied on the expansion of the psalm in 2 Pet 3,8.

Other contemporary writers referred to this understanding of world history, but without equally explicit reference to Ps 90,4 or 2 Pet 3,8. Cyprian (c. 200-258) in *Exhortation to Martyrdom* 11 includes in a list of things involving the number seven "the first seven days in the divine arrangement containing seven thousand of years" (*primi in dispositione divina septem dies annorum septem millia continentes*). He makes no reference

to Ps 90,4 or 2 Pet 3,8, but what he says is probably dependent on one or both of them; as we have seen, these texts are the source of this idea. Other third-century texts that briefly refer to this understanding of world history include: *De duobus montibus Sina et Sion* 4; Commodian, *Instructiones* 35 line 6, and *Carmen* line 785; and *De Pascha computus* 17¹⁵.

Likewise Tyconius (active 370-390) in *The Book of Rules* says that “six days are the age of the world, that is six thousand years” (*sex dies sunt mundi aetas, id est sex milia annorum*), but without giving any argument for this equation¹⁶. Ambrose (c. 340-397) in his *Exposition of the Gospel According to Luke*, commenting on Luke 17,4, says, “because on the seventh day God rested from all his works, after the seven days of that world lasting rest is promised to us” (*quia cum septimo die requieverit Deus ab omnibus operibus suis, post hebdomadam istius mundi quies diuturna promittitur*). He then lists “sabbaths” of days, months, sabbaths, years, and generations, ending with “finally of the world itself” (*postremo ipsius mundi*).

In *City of God* 20.7 Augustine (354-430) summarizes this understanding of world history, quoting 2 Pet 3,8 as the basis for it. He says this view is not objectionable if the joys of the saints in the one-thousand-year sabbath are seen as spiritual; he himself once held this view. But he rejects an understanding in which the sabbath joys are carnal. Augustine goes on to argue that a thousand years in Revelation should not be understood literally. In *City of God* 22.30.5 Augustine proposes that the seven days of creation should be understood as seven ages into which world history is divided. These ages do not consist of a thousand years each, nor are they equal in length. They are followed by an eighth, eternal day.

Later writers continued both interpretations of world history discussed by Augustine. Some continued to think of world history as consisting of one-thousand-year days, while others thought in terms of seven ages whose

¹⁵ J. DANIELLOU, *The Origins of Latin Christianity* (A History of Early Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicea vol. 3; London – Philadelphia, PA 1977) 45 [*De montibus Sina et Sion*], 120-121 [Commodian], 127-128 [*De Pascha computus*]. In J. DANIELLOU, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity* (A History of Early Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicea vol. 1; London – Philadelphia, PA 1964) 391-404, the author analyzes the passage from *Jubilees* discussed in section I above and most of the passages discussed in sections II and IV. In his analysis, Daniélou does not focus on interpretation of Ps 90,4 and 2 Pet 3,8 as I do here.

¹⁶ F.C. BURKITT, *The Book of Rules of Tyconius*. Newly Edited from the MSS with an Introduction and an Examination into the Text of the Biblical Quotations (Cambridge 1894) 56. Later Tyconius supports the equation of one day with a thousand years by quoting Gen 2,17 (BURKITT, *Book of Rules of Tyconius*, 61), apparently presuming the use of Ps 90,4 and/or 2 Pet 3,8 to explain how Adam could live to age 930 and still die on the day he ate the forbidden fruit.

length was not precisely calculated. The former view may be reflected in Ussher's biblical chronology (1650) ¹⁷. This was based on chronological indications in the Bible along with other historical information, but was compatible with the idea that world history would consist of seven thousand years. Ussher calculated the date of creation as 4004 BCE, implying that the world had existed for 5,654 years at the time he made the calculation.

More explicit use of the idea that world history consisted of one-thousand-year days is found in Joseph Mede, *A Key to the Apocalypse* (1627) ¹⁸. When Mede discusses the millennium in Rev 20,1-6, he points out that Justin Martyr looked forward to it and later quotes *Dialogue* 80-81 in full. Mede proposes that the day of judgment lasts a thousand years on the basis of 2 Pet 3,7-8. Verse 7 speaks of the day of judgment, and v. 8, as we have seen, says that with the Lord one day is like a thousand years. Later Mede says that Jews called the seventh millenary the great day of judgment. In support of this he quotes *b. Sanh.* 97a and *Midr. Tehillim* 90.17 and says that 2 Pet 3,8 confirms this tradition.

Another interpreter who used the idea that world history consists of one-thousand-year days is Thomas Newton, *Dissertations on the Prophecies* (1754). In Dissertation XXV, commenting on Rev 20,1-6, Newton says that the Jewish "church" prior to Revelation, and the Christian church afterward, believed that the thousand years mentioned in Revelation would be "the seventh millenary of the world" ¹⁹. In support of this Newton cites several of the texts discussed above. Newton himself does not mention Ps 90,4 or 2 Pet 3,8, but these passages are mentioned by the texts he cites from *b. Sanh* 97a, the *Letter of Barnabas*, Justin and Lactantius.

In Dissertation XXVI Newton calculates the time of the millennium using the reference to 1,260 days found in Rev 11,2-3 and other texts. This calculation involved understanding "day" to mean one year rather than a thousand years. This understanding of "day" is not indicated as clearly in scripture as an understanding of "day" to mean a thousand years is indicated in Ps 90,4 and 2 Pet 3,8. Perhaps the clearest indication of it is found in Ezek 4,1-6 ²⁰. Newton suggests that a period of 1,260 years

¹⁷ This is argued by J. JARICK, "The Fall of the House (of Cards) of Ussher: Why the World as We Know It Did Not End at Sunset on 22 October 1997", in *Apocalyptic in History and Tradition* (eds. C. ROWLAND – J. BARTON) (JSPSup 43; Sheffield 2002) 233-252.

¹⁸ R.B. COOPER, *A Translation of Mede's Clavis Apocalyptica* (London 1833).

¹⁹ T. NEWTON, *Dissertations on the Prophecies Which Have Remarkably Been Fulfilled, and at This Time Are Fulfilling in the World* (London 1832) 577.

²⁰ In this passage, Ezekiel is told to sleep on his left side 390 days equal to the number of years the house of Israel will be punished. He is told to sleep on his right side forty

begins in 727 when “the pope and the people of Rome revolted from the exarch of Ravenna and shook off their allegiance to the Greek emperor” so that soon afterward the pope “acted as an absolute temporal prince” ²¹. That would imply that the millennium will begin 1,260 years later in 1987. Newton remarks that this would put it “near the year 2000 after Christ; and at the end of the 6,000th year of the world” ²².

Another interpreter who used the idea that world history consists of one-thousand-year days is Joseph Bellamy in “The Millennium” (1794). Bellamy suggests that Jewish observation of the seventh day, the seventh month and the seventh year might indicate that just as God created the world in seven days, so God’s new creation may take seven thousand years ²³. In suggesting this, Bellamy makes no reference to Ps 90,4 or 2 Pet 3,8. Neither does he clearly indicate the beginning point of the seven thousand years, and so leaves the time when the millennial sabbath would begin unclear. We might suppose that this calculation agrees with Bellamy’s later more specific calculation using the number 1,260 derived from Rev 11,2-3 ²⁴. Even here Bellamy is somewhat vague, but he seems to suggest that the period of 1,260 years preceding the end began when

days, one day for each year the house of Judah will be punished. Newton appeals to this text in Dissertation XIV (*Dissertations*, 211-212). Tyconius (see BURKITT, *Book of Rules of Tyconius*, 60) sees the equivalence of “year” and “day” indicated by the Latin translation of Luke 4,20, quoting Isa 61,2, which parallels the acceptable year with the day of vengeance (*praedicare annum acceptabilem et diem retributionis*). Other foundations for the idea that “day” means one year are discussed by E.B. ELLIOTT, *Horae Apocalypticæ or A Commentary on the Apocalypse, Critical and Historical*, 4 vols. (London 1846) 3:218-247; W.H. SHEA, *Selected Studies on Prophetic Interpretation*. Revised Edition (Silver Spring, MD 1992) 67-104.

²¹ NEWTON, *Dissertations*, 605.

²² NEWTON, *Dissertations*, 606, cf. 212. K.G.C. NEWPORT (*Apocalypse and Millennium*, 8-9) observes that the ideas that “day” means one year and that the Pope/Roman Catholic Church was the Antichrist were very common among English-speaking Protestants from the time of the Reformation until about 1850; he further describes the views of many others who used these ideas the way Newton did, combining them, in some instances, with the idea that world history consisted of one-thousand-year days. NEWPORT (*Apocalypse and Millennium*, 104) mentions two who thought that world history consisted of one-thousand-year days: J. Kershaw (1730?-1797) who quoted the work of Newton; and W. Whiston mentioned in note 3 above. Pre-Reformation use of the Book of Revelation to criticize the papacy is described by A.W. WAINWRIGHT, *Mysterious Apocalypse*. Interpreting the Book of Revelation (Nashville, TN 1993) 57-60. Naturally Roman Catholic interpreters rejected these ideas (see NEWPORT, *Apocalypse and Millennium*, 66-90; WAINWRIGHT, *Mysterious Apocalypse*, 61-66).

²³ J. BELLAMY, “The Millennium”, *The Millennium; or, the Thousand Years of Prosperity; Promised to the Church of God; in the Old Testament and in the New; Shortly to Commence; and To Be Carried on to Perfection; Under the Auspices of Him, Who, in the Vision, Was Presented to St. John* (Elizabeth Town 1794) 9-49, here 20.

²⁴ BELLAMY, “Millennium”, 24-25.

the bishop of Rome became universal Pope in 606 CE. If so, he expects the millennium to begin in 1866.

In 1846 E.B. Elliott calculated the time the millennium would begin on the basis of the 1,260 days mentioned in Rev 11,2-3 and elsewhere, understanding them as referring to 1,260 years. He argued that the 1,260 years began in 530 CE when Justinian's Decree and Code recognized the Pope's supremacy, and ended in 1790 when the French Revolution gave the Pope's supremacy a deadly blow. To this he added seventy-five years (reflecting the 1,335 days mentioned in Dan 12,12), yielding the date 1865²⁵. Elliott found support for this date in its being close to "the probable termination of the world's 6000th year", "the opening epoch of the world's seventh millenary". Elliott referred to this as "the early and well-known Jewish opinion" and quoted a number of passages in support of this. These include the passages from the *Letter of Barnabas*, Irenaeus and Lactantius discussed above which explicitly base this view on Ps 90,4 or 2 Pet 3,8²⁶. Elliott calculated the date of creation as 4138 BCE and the beginning of the seventh millennium as approximately 1862 CE²⁷.

A view that world history consists of seven less precisely calculated dispensations seems to derive from the work of John Nelson Darby (1800-1882). Darby was a priest of the Church of Ireland and later a leader of the Plymouth Brethren. Following the thought of Darby, in 1864 W.C. Bayne listed the following eight dispensations:

Eden dispensation — Gen 1,24 – 3,24

Antedeluvian — Gen 4,4 – 8,14

Patriarchal — Gen 8,15 – 50,26

Mosaic — from the oppression of Israel under Pharaoh to John the Baptist

Messianic — from the birth to the ascension of Jesus Christ

Holy Ghost or Gospel dispensation — from Pentecost to the time of the gathering of the Saints under Christ at his coming

Millennial — from the second coming of Jesus to the judgment of the great white throne

Eternal state — New Jerusalem descends to new earth and the tabernacle of God is with men²⁸

²⁵ ELLIOTT, *Horae Apocalypticæ*, 4:251.

²⁶ ELLIOTT, *Horae Apocalypticæ*, 4:252-253.

²⁷ ELLIOTT, *Horae Apocalypticæ*, 4:254-260.

²⁸ W.C. BAYNE, "The Dispensations, Prophetically and Doctrinally Considered", in *Waymarks in the Wilderness and Scriptural Guide*, vol. 1 (ed. J. INGLIS) (New York 1864) 440-453, here 446-447. This idea is somewhat similar to the view of Augustine mentioned above, but Augustine's ages are not the same as Bayne's dispensations. Augustine's ages are: First — Adam to the deluge; Second — deluge to Abraham; Third — Abraham to David; Fourth — David to the captivity; Fifth — captivity to birth of Christ; Sixth

CONCLUSION

Derivation of the idea that one day for God is like a thousand human years from Ps 90,4 and 2 Pet 3,8 has had a long history among Jews and Christians. Jews derived the idea from Ps 90,4 and used it in the four different ways described above, namely,

- 1) to argue that Adam died on the same day he ate the fruit of the tree, as was predicted in Gen 2,17;
- 2) to argue that the history of the world consists of one-thousand-year days corresponding to the seven days of creation in Gen 1,1 – 2,3;
- 3) to argue that the day of the Lord or the day of the Messiah lasts one thousand years;
- 4) to argue that the Torah preceded the creation of the world by two thousand years.

Some Christians also derived the idea from Ps 90,4 and used it in the second of these ways.

In 3,8 the author of 2 Peter elaborated Ps 90,4 and used it to argue that divine and human time are incommensurable. But most later Christian interpreters understood 2 Pet 3,8 to mean that one day for God is like a thousand human years and used it as an expression of the same idea that had been derived from Ps 90,4. They used it in the first three ways listed above.

In Christian history the most common use of this idea was the second one listed above, namely, to view the history of the world as consisting of one-thousand-year days corresponding to the days of creation. This use seems to have declined after the nineteenth century, perhaps because scientific research began to indicate that the age of the world was much greater than seven thousand years. The related idea that the history of the world consisted of dispensations that had no precise duration could more easily accommodate the developing scientific understanding of world history.

The Athenaeum of Ohio
Cincinnati, OH
U.S.A.

Terrance CALLAN

— now passing; Seventh — rest; Eighth — the Lord's Day. Augustine's third, fourth and fifth ages are based on Matt 1,1-17.

SUMMARY

This essay traces the history of interpretation of Ps 90,4 by Jews and Christians, and of 2 Pet 3,8 by Christians. Most of the time these texts have not been understood as they were originally meant. Instead they have served as the basis of the idea that for God the word “day” means a thousand human years. This idea has been used in various ways, most often to view the history of the world as consisting of one-thousand-year days corresponding to the days of creation.

RES BIBLIOGRAPHICA

- Graham I. DAVIES, *Exodus 1–18. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*.
Volume 1: Chapters 1–10 (International Critical Commentary). London, T&T Clark, 2020. xlv-680 p. 14.5 × 22. €100,00
- Graham I. DAVIES, *Exodus 1–18. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*.
Volume 2: Chapters 11–18 (International Critical Commentary). London, T&T Clark, 2020. vii-617 p. 14.5 × 22. €95,00

Diese beiden Kommentarbände zum ersten Teil des Exodusbuches, die der emeritierte Professor für Altes Testament an der Universität Cambridge und Life Fellow am dortigen Fitzwilliam College vorgelegt hat, sind in zweifacher Weise bemerkenswert: Sie repräsentieren überhaupt den ersten Exoduskommentar, der in der renommierten, mehr als hundert Jahre bestehenden englischsprachigen Kommentarreihe erschienen ist, nachdem ein an Archibald Robert Stirling Kennedy im Jahr 1905 vergebener Auftrag nicht zum Ziel führte (I, xiii), und sie stellen die bei weitem ausführlichste Kommentierung dar, welche die ersten 18 Kapitel des Exodusbuches bislang erfahren haben; sie umfassen alles in allem 1.348 Seiten! Nach Auskunft des Autors wurde das große Werk in den 90-er Jahren des vorigen Jahrhunderts begonnen und war in seinem ersten Teil Anfang 2018 abgeschlossen (I, xiii-xiv).

Dem ersten Band ist eine 116 Seiten umfassende Einführung vorangestellt. Sie handelt kurz über die Benennungen des Exodusbuches, seine Stellung im Kanon und seine Inhalte (I, 1-4) und beschreibt dann sehr ausführlich die hebräischen Textzeugen und die der Versionen (I, 5-64). Alle Qumrantexte, die Passagen aus dem Exodusbuch belegen, und selbst die Fragmente aus der Kairoer Geniza werden einzeln aufgeführt und kurz charakterisiert. Man merkt deutlich, dass hier ein Interessenschwerpunkt des Verfassers liegt, der sich ja auch um die hebräischen Inschriften verdient gemacht hat. Es folgt eine relativ knappe Darstellung vom Aufbau des Buches, seiner Gattungen und theologischer Themen (I, 64-72), wobei Davies deren Unterschiede herausstellt. Ihren Abschluss findet die Einführung mit einer ausführlichen Darstellung der Forschungsgeschichte zur literarischen Entstehung des Exodusbuches (I, 72-87), die in eine Diskussion seiner Quellen und Redaktionen und eine Übersicht über die priesterlichen und nicht-priesterlichen Abschnitte mündet (I, 87-116). Eine zusammenfassende Darstellung des historischen Hintergrundes des Buches fehlt, doch werden die gängigen religionsgeschichtlichen Erwägungen, die historisch relevanten Termini und Realien sowie die archäologischen Zeugnisse zu den im Buch erwähnten Ortslagen in der Einzelauslegung ausführlich diskutiert. Dabei wird deutlich, dass Davies weiterhin die Ramessidenzeit als wahrscheinlichen historischen Hintergrund für die im Exodusbuch geschilderten Ereignisse ansieht.

Die Textauslegung vollzieht sich in sechs großen Abschnitten, die jeweils weiter untergliedert sind. Sie sind wie folgt überschrieben: „Israel in Egypt and

the early life of Moses“ (Ex 1,1 – 2,22), „Moses' commissioning and approach to Pharaoh“ (2,23 – 7,13), „Moses and Aaron before Pharaoh (The first nine plagues)“ (7,14 – 10,29), „Passover and Departure“ (11,1 – 13,22), „The deliverance at the Sea“ (14,1 – 15,21), „The journey to the Mountain of God“ (15,22 – 18,27). Die gewählten Überschriften lassen schon ein Stück weit Davies' Gesamtverständnis des Buchteils erkennen: Das Drama von der Unterdrückung und Befreiung Israels wird zwar angesprochen, steht aber für ihn nicht im Zentrum. Die insgesamt 39 relativ kleinteiligen Unterabschnitte, in denen die Einzeltexte ausgelegt werden, gliedern sich folgendermaßen: Am Anfang steht jeweils eine längere Einleitung (1), in der kurz die Abgrenzung und der Aufbau der Texteinheit beschrieben werden. Ihren Mittelpunkt bildet jedoch eine ausführliche Darstellung der Forschung zur Literaturgeschichte des Textabschnitts, deren Diskussion und die Zuweisung der Passagen zu den entsprechenden Quellenwerken bzw. Redaktionen. Zuweilen werden auch noch traditions- und religionsgeschichtliche Fragestellungen angefügt. Erst dann folgt die Übersetzung des hebräischen Textes (2), die ausführlich mit Anmerkungen kommentiert ist (3). Die eigentliche Auslegung erfolgt in der Form der Einzelexegese (4). Erst ganz am Schluss werden die textkritischen Varianten behandelt (5).

Das eindeutige Hauptanliegen des Kommentars ist der Nachweis, dass die klassische Drei-Quellen-Theorie gegenüber den neueren redaktions- und kompositionsgeschichtlichen Modellen, die seit 50 Jahren diskutiert werden, immer noch eine mögliche, wenn nicht sogar die bessere Erklärung für die Entstehung des Pentateuch liefert. Auf diesen Nachweis zielt ein Großteil der forschungsgeschichtlichen Überblicke und Diskussionen sowohl in der allgemeinen Einführung (I, 72–116) als auch in allen Einleitungen der Einzelauslegungen ab. Während über die Unterscheidung von priesterlichen und nicht-priesterlichen Texten in der gegenwärtigen Kontroverse weitgehend Einigkeit herrscht, möchte Davies eine gewisse Schwäche des Quellenmodells, dass in ihm der nicht-priesterliche Elohists nur sporadisch belegt war oder gar aufgegeben wurde, dadurch ausgleichen, dass er den Nachweis zu führen sucht, dass der Quelle E gegenüber dem ebenfalls nicht-priesterlichen Jahwisten ein erheblich höherer Textanteil zugewiesen werden kann als dies bislang gesehen wurde. Hatte etwa Martin Noth den Anteil des Elohisten noch auf einige Abschnitte in Exodus 1, 3 und 18 und vereinzelte Verse in Exodus 13–14 beschränkt und sein Vorkommen in der Plagen-Auszugsgeschichte ganz gelegnet¹, so vertritt Davies als erster die These, dass die nicht-priesterlichen Plagen-Erzählungen weitgehend vom Elohisten stammen, während sich die jahwistischen Anteile hier auf kleinere Ergänzungen beschränken (I, 97–102).

Seine Textzuschreibungen zu den drei Pentateuchquellen innerhalb von Exodus 1–18 hat Davies in zwei Anmerkungen aufgelistet (für P in I, 94 Anm. 109, für J und E in I, 102–103 Anm. 117). Sie seien hier zur besseren Übersicht tabellarisch aufgeführt. Da in Davies' Auflistung die Zuschreibung von Versteilen zuweilen recht pauschal erfolgt, habe ich, wo nötig, die genauen Versaufteilungen aus den Einzelauslegungen heraus spezifiziert. Ergänzt habe ich die als redaktionell angesehenen Verse, soweit ich sie aus der Einführung (I, 103–106) und den Einzelauslegungen erkennen konnte.

¹ Vgl. M. NOTH, *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch* (Stuttgart 1948) 39; DERS., *Das zweite Buch Mose. Exodus* (ATD 5; Göttingen 1968) 52–53.

<i>Kap.</i>	<i>Jahwist</i>	<i>Elohist</i>	<i>Priesterschrift</i>	<i>Redaktionelles</i>
1	6, 8-12	15-22	1-5, 7*, 13-14	
2	11-22	1-10, 23aa	23aβb-25	
3	2-4a, 5, 7-8, 16-19	1, 4b, 6, 9-15		21-22 (R [?])
4	1-8, 10-14aa, 19-20a, 24-26, 29-31*	17-18, 20b, 27-28		9 (R ^P), 14aβ-16 (R ^{JE}), 21-23 (R ^{P?}), 29-31 (J+R ^P)
5	3-23*	1-2		(Ergänzung von Aaron durch R ^{JE})
6	1		2-12	13 (R ^P), 14-27, (28-30) (P ^S)
7	15b-16aa, 17bβ, 20aβ	14-15a, 16aβ, 17abαγ, 18, 20b-21a, 23-29	1-13, 19-20a, 21b-22	
8		4-11aa, 16-22, 23aβ-28	1-3, 11aβb, 12-15	23aa (R ^{JE})
9	22-23a, 24a, 25b, 35	1-7, 13-21, 23b, 24b-25a, 26-34	8-12	
10	12-13aa ₁ , 14a, 15aa ₂ b, 20, 21-23, 27	1a, 3-11, 13aa ₂ βb, 14b, 15aa ₁ .aa ₃ β, 16-19, 24-26, 28-29		1b-2 (Nähe zu Dtn)
11		3b-8	9-10	1-3a (R [?])
12	21-23, 25-27, 33-34, 37b-38?, 39	29-32	1-20, 28, 40-51	24 (R ^P), 35-36 (R [?]), 37a (dtr. Itinerar) 43-49, 50 (P ^S)
13	3-4, 21-22	17-19	1-2	5-9+11-16 (vordtn. Gesetze), 10 (R ^{P?}), 20 (dtr. Itinerar)
14	5a, 6-7, 10-14, 16aa, 19b-20, 24, 25b, 27b, 28b, 30, 31b	5b, 9aa, 15, 19a, 21aβ, 25a, 31a	1-4, 8, 16aβb-18, 21*-23, 26-27*, 28(!), 29	9aβb?
15	22-25a	20-21, 25b		1?, 2-18 (Hymnus), 19 (R ^{P?}), 26 (dtr.), 27 (dtr. Itinerar)

<i>Kap.</i>	<i>Jahwist</i>	<i>Elohist</i>	<i>Priesterschrift</i>	<i>Redaktionelles</i>
16		4-5, 26, 21, 27-31?	1b-3, 6-7, 9-20, 22-25, 32-36	1a (dtr. Itinerar, priesterl. bearbeitet), 8 (späte Glosse)
17	3-6	8-13*, 15		1 (dtr. Itinerar, priesterl. bearbeitet), 2, 7 (unsicher), 14 (aus Dtn), 16 (aus anderem Kontext)
18		1-2a, 3-12, 13-17		2b (R ^{JE})

Davies' Entscheidung, einen Großteil des nicht-priesterlichen Textbestandes der Plage-Erzählungen nicht mehr dem Jahwisten, sondern dem Elohisten zuzuschreiben, beruht vor allem auf drei Gründen. Erstens ermöglicht er sie durch seine methodische Einschätzung, dass bei der Literarkritik dem Sprachkriterium ein geringerer Stellenwert als den Widersprüchen, Dubletten und narrativen Zusammenhängen zukomme (I, 88-89). Seiner Meinung nach konnte darum der Elohist nach der von ihm geschilderten Offenbarung des Gottesnamens in Ex 3,13-15 genauso wie der Jahwist das Tetragramm verwenden, daneben aber auch weiter die Gottesbezeichnung ^w*lohîm* (I, 97). Zweitens ist er der Meinung, dass Ex 5,1-2 als Dublette zum Vers 5,3, der aufgrund 3,18 zu J gehöre, dem Elohisten zugewiesen werden müsse. Da aber seiner Ansicht nach der Beginn der nicht-priesterlichen Plage-Erzählungen (7,14-15a.17*) direkt an 5,1-2 anschließt, sei es naheliegend, dass auch diese zum größeren Teil der Quelle E angehören. Drittens stellt der Stab des Mose, den dieser zur Schlange verwandelte, in 7,15b.17bβ einen deutlichen Einschub in die erste Plage-Erzählung dar. Da Davies aber die Bezugsstelle 4,1-5 dem Jahwisten zugeordnet hat, stellen sich dessen Partien als bloße Ergänzungen zu den Plagegeschichten heraus. In den Worten von Davies heißt das: „Verses [7,]14 and 17a pick up most closely from 5,1-2, which we have assigned to E, while v. 15(b) and v. 16(αα) are linked to 3,18, 4,1-5 and 5,3, which we have ascribed to J. On this basis the 'staff' sections in vv. 17 and 20 should be from J too, with the remainder of the non-Priestly text probably being from E“ (I, 497; vgl. 593). Einen Vorteil seiner neuen literargeschichtlichen Zuordnung sieht Davies z.B. darin, dass die nicht-priesterliche Passa-Anweisung in 12,21-27, für die zuvor im Plagen-Auszugsdrama kein Platz gefunden werden konnte ², nun ohne Probleme dem Jahwisten zugeschrieben werden könne, da dessen Plagen-geschichte ja nur in Fragmenten bekannt sei (II, 83). Allerdings hat auch seine Lösung ihre Schwierigkeiten: Davies muss annehmen, dass auch der Elohist in 9,1.13; 10,3 die sonst vom Jahwisten gebrauchte Gottesbezeichnung „Gott der Hebräer“ (3,18; 5,3; 7,16) verwendet habe (I, 594), oder sieht sich gezwungen, den Rückverweis auf die Dreitagereise zu einem Gottesdienst in der Wüste in 8,23αα, von der zuvor nur in jahwistischen Texten die Rede war (3,18; 5,3), einzig aufgrund

² Vgl. J. WELLHAUSEN, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs* (Berlin ³1899=1963) 73; der Auszugsbericht Ex 12,29-39 schließt direkt an 11,4-8 an.

des postulierten elohistischen Kontexts als eine redaktionelle Angleichung auszuwählen (I, 546), obwohl kein sprachlicher oder inhaltlicher Bruch vorliegt. So wird sich wohl erst noch erweisen müssen, ob Davies' Ausweitung des elohistischen Textanteils im Exodusbuch wirklich eine Verbesserung der Quellentheorie darstellt.

In der kritischen Würdigung des Kommentars muss wohl als erstes lobend festgehalten werden, dass Graham Davies in einer Zeit, in der immer mehr Kommentatoren zu einer synchronen Auslegung übergehen, „contrary to the ‘unitarians’ of all colours“ (I, 342) an einer diachronen Auslegung des Pentateuchs festhält. Er ist sich des Wertes der Erkenntnisse von 200 Jahren historisch-kritischer Bibelauslegung bewusst. Auch hat er wohl recht damit, dass er gegenüber einem in der gegenwärtigen Forschung erkennbaren Hang zur Spätdatierung weiterhin die Ansicht verteidigt, dass es vor-priesterliche und d.h. vorexilische Exoduserzählungen gegeben hat. Wenn Davies seine Pentateuchquellen J und E in die Königszeit vor dem Untergang des Nordreichs im Jahr 722 datiert (I, 108), dann liegt das nicht allzu weit von den Ergebnissen meiner kompositions- und redaktionsgeschichtlichen Untersuchung entfernt, nach der die „politische Mose-Erzählung“ (Ex 1,15 – 2,23aa + 4,19-20a.24-26) in das 9. Jh., die Plagen-Auszugs-Erzählung (5,3 – 12,39*) in die erste Hälfte des 7. Jhs., die älteste Version der Berufungserzählung (3,1-8*.16-17) in die zweite Hälfte des 8. Jhs. und die älteste Schicht der Schilfmeererzählung (14,5a.6-30*) in das späte 10. Jh. v.Chr. gehören, auch wenn ich meine, dass die nicht-priesterliche Exoduskomposition (Ex 1,9 – 34,32*) insgesamt erst aus der Exilszeit stammt³.

Die Stärke von Davies Kommentar liegt sicher in seinen überaus reichen philologischen und archäologischen Informationen. Davies' intime Kenntnis der Textzeugen und der Textgeschichte wurden schon erwähnt. Wohl in keinem anderen Exoduskommentar wird etwa die Frage der Textabgrenzung und Textgliederung in so engem Bezug auf die Handschriften aus Qumran diskutiert wie hier, obwohl diese eigentlich schon zur Auslegungs- und nicht mehr zur Ursprungsgeschichte der Texte gehören. Schließlich kommt auch den ausführlichen Darstellungen der Forschungsgeschichte zur Pentateuchentstehung ein hoher Informationswert zu. Etwa 450 Titel hat Davies allein zur Literaturgeschichte des Pentateuchs bei seinen Forschungsabrissen und -diskussionen berücksichtigt, rund 50 weitere zur Erklärung des Moseliedes in Exodus 15, dazu noch eine Fülle von Spezialliteratur zu exegetischen, archäologischen, historischen und auch religionsgeschichtlichen Themen. Das ist eine gewaltige Leistung des Autors und für den Leser eine ergiebige Fundgrube. Soweit ich erkennen konnte, sind Veröffentlichungen bis etwa in das Jahr 2012 berücksichtigt (z.B. mein Kommentar in der Auslegung ab Exodus 12)⁴. Allerdings sollte der Leser sich vergegenwärtigen, dass die Literatur aus der Perspektive der Quellentheorie ausgewählt wurde und hinsichtlich der neueren Pentateuchdebatte meist nicht die exegetischen Beweggründe erkennen lässt, welche einige Forscher zur Entwicklung alternativer

³ Vgl. R. ALBERTZ, *Exodus 1–18* (ZBK.AT 2.1; Zürich 2012, ²2017) 64–65, 88, 215–216, 247–248; DERS., *Exodus 19–40* (ZBK.AT 2.2; Zürich 2015) 323–324; DERS., *Pentateuchstudien* (FAT 117; Tübingen 2018) 473–474.

⁴ Nicht mehr berücksichtigt sind die Kommentare von H. UZSCHNEIDER – W. OSWALD, *Exodus 1–15* (IEKAT; Stuttgart 2013); C. DOHMEN, *Exodus 1–18* (HThK.AT; Freiburg u.a. 2015).

Pentateuchmodelle veranlasst haben. Wer voll verstehen will, um was es in der Debatte geht, dem bleibt eine eigene Lektüre der betreffenden Werke nicht erspart.

Es bleiben aber auch eine ganze Reihe von Punkten in diesem großen Kommentar kritisch anzumerken: 1. Möglicherweise alten Regeln der Kommentarreihe folgend, wird die Übersetzung des hebräischen Textes recht stiefmütterlich behandelt. Sie steht nicht prominent am Anfang, sondern geht — zumal im Petiddruck gesetzt — im Gang der Auslegung fast unter. Trotz vorheriger Überlegungen zur Gliederung des Textabschnitts bleibt der übersetzte Bibeltext ein ungegliederter Block. Allein die priesterlichen Passagen werden klar durch Kursivdruck gekennzeichnet. Die sonstigen literarischen Zuweisungen werden dagegen nur durch eckige Klammern im Fließtext angedeutet. Ihre Aussage bleibt aber für den Leser völlig uneindeutig: Sie können meinen, dass der eingeklammerte Text in einem E-Kontext zu J gehört, oder in einem J-Kontext zu E; oder sie können eine redaktionelle Zufügung bezeichnen. Um dieses herauszubekommen, muss man die Einleitungen und manchmal auch noch die Einzelauslegung durcharbeiten. Ist dies vom so Verfasser gewollt? Oder soll der fromme Bibelforscher nicht zu sehr durch Ergebnisse der historischen Quellenkritik irritiert werden?

2. Davies handhabt die Textkritik ausgesprochen restriktiv. Er hält auch in solchen Fällen, in denen der masoretische Text (MT) keinen guten Sinn ergibt, fast immer — und teilweise mit erheblichem Erklärungsaufwand — an diesem fest (vgl. etwa zu Ex 5,5.16 in I, 392-393, 405). Ich habe nur einen Fall entdeckt, an dem der MT von ihm konjiziert wurde (Ex 18,11, vgl. II, 557). Nun ist es sicher richtig, dass die Forschergenerationen vor Entdeckung der Qumranhandschriften den MT teilweise zu leichtfertig korrigiert haben; doch Davies' Ansicht, dass heute durch die übrigen Textzeugen kaum ein älterer und besserer hebräischer Text rekonstruiert werden kann (I, 28-31), geht wohl doch zu weit in die entgegengesetzte Richtung. Der merkwürdige Umstand, dass trotz erheblichem Aufwand bei Beschreibung der Textzeugen die textkritischen Varianten erst ganz am Schluss aufgelistet werden, nachdem der Text schon ausgelegt ist, hat offenbar mit dieser methodischen Abwertung der Textkritik zu tun. Selbst dort, wo die Varianten vielleicht keinen älteren Text bezeugen, aber doch auf Schwierigkeiten im MT hinweisen, die durch redaktionelle Überarbeitung eines zugrundeliegenden hebräischen Textes entstanden sein könnten (so etwa der merkwürdige Umstand, dass Joseph erst nach der Summierung der leiblichen Nachkommen Jakobs aus der priesterlichen Liste Ex 1,1-5a in V. 5b genannt wird, vgl. die abweichenden Lesarten von 4QExod^b und LXX), wird dies von Davies nicht für die Auslegung fruchtbar gemacht.

3. Es war schon davon die Rede gewesen, dass Davies innerhalb der Literarkritik dem Sprach- und Stilkriterium nur noch eine untergeordnete Bedeutung bei der Zuschreibung bestimmter Passagen zu einer literarischen Schicht zuerkennt. Seine These, dass auch der Elohist nach Ex 3,14-15 den JHWH-Namen gebrauchen könne, aber nicht müsse, ermöglichte ihm zwar eine erhebliche Ausweitung des ihm zugeschriebenen Textbestandes, setzt damit aber auch ein wichtiges Kriterium zur Unterscheidung zwischen den beiden nicht-priesterlichen Pentateuchquellen außer Kraft. Nach Davies' Meinung können diese ab Exodus 3 nur noch aufgrund von Dubletten voneinander abgegrenzt werden (I, 96-99). Doch erstens ist die Dublettenartigkeit zweier Passagen nicht immer einfach gegeben, sondern häufig stark interpretationsabhängig und zweitens beweist sie ja nicht, wie im Rahmen der Quellentheorie häufig kurzschlüssig gefolgert wird, dass die

Passage, die nicht zu der einen Quelle gehört, notwendig zu der anderen gehören müsse. Es könnte sich ja auch um Erzählvarianten oder Redaktionen handeln. Dass die Aufweichung des Sprach- und Stilkriteriums zu riskanten literarkritischen Entscheidungen führen kann, zeigt Davies' Zuweisung der Finsternisplage (10,21-23.27) zum Jahwisten, weil sie einen „dublettenartigen“ Einschub in die angeblich elohistische Heuschreckenplage darstelle (I, 662-663). Denn Stil und Sprachgebrauch (das Nomen *môšāb* im Plural, das in 10,23 benutzt wird, begegnet sonst nur bei P, Ez und Chr) sprechen eher, wie schon Martin Noth feststellte, für die Priesterschrift⁵, die hier allerdings eine Bearbeitung und kein separates Quellenwerk wäre, eine Einschätzung, die Davies vehement ablehnt (I, 94-95). Dass sich Davies der Schwierigkeit seiner Zuweisung bewusst ist, macht das folgende Zitat deutlich: „So similarity of wording in the present case need not imply Priestly authorship (or dependence of it on P): the plague of darkness may belong to an older level of tradition from which P took certain motifs and terminology“ (I, 664).

4. Davies hat sich gegen die selbst bei neueren Vertretern der Quellentheorie wachsende Tendenz, mit späteren Ergänzungen oder Redaktion der älteren Textschichten zu rechnen, bewusst für einen möglichst restriktiven Gebrauch von redaktionsgeschichtlichen Thesen entschieden: „We have taken a conservative view in the identification of such additions, limiting ourselves to cases, where there is clear evidence of them and avoiding the temptation to indulge in the wholesale speculation which can be observed in both recent and earlier scholarship“ (I, 103). Aus einer solchen Haltung heraus nimmt Davies so gut wie keine Einsicht aus der neueren redaktionsgeschichtlich orientierten Pentateuchforschung auf. Soweit ich ersehen konnte, ließ er sich nur in einem einzigen Fall von Jan Christian Gertz überzeugen⁶, nämlich dass der Ausblick auf ein drittes Zeichen des Mose in Ex 4,9 von der priesterlichen Schilderung der Blutplage in 7,19-22 abhängig ist (I, 311, 318-319). Doch beschränkte er — anders als Gertz — die redaktionelle Herkunft eben auf diesen einen Vers, um den übrigen Abschnitt 4,1-8 — ohne dass ein Bruch zwischen V. 8 und V. 9 nachweisbar wäre — weiter der Quelle J zuschreiben zu können.

Leider führt diese abwehrende Haltung gegenüber der Redaktionsgeschichte bei Davies dazu, dass er sich um die redaktionellen Passagen, die auch er sich aus unterschiedlichen Gründen gezwungen sieht anzunehmen, nicht allzu viel Mühe macht. Im Unterschied zu den drei Quellen, werden sie nicht aufgelistet und nicht eindeutig spezifiziert. Anders als die „New Documentarians“ geht Davies zwar immer noch von mindestens zwei Redaktionsstufen aus, R^{JE}, auf der J und E miteinander, und R^P, auf der die beiden mit P verbunden wurden (I, 108 Anm. 122), doch sind sie nicht immer voneinander abgehoben, und es gibt offenbar noch weitere, nicht näher zu charakterisierende Stufen dazwischen. Eine Zusammenstellung der als redaktionell eingestuft Verse findet sich auf den Seiten I, 103-106; sie ist allerdings nicht ganz vollständig.

Dass redaktionsgeschichtliche Erwägungen eigentlich auch in dem von Davies vorgelegten Quellenmodell eine größere Rolle spielen müssten, macht die Tatsache

⁵ Vgl. NOTH, *Exodus*, 52-53; zur Forschungsdiskussion vgl. ALBERTZ, *Pentateuchstudien*, 131-134.

⁶ Vgl. J.C. GERTZ, *Tradition und Redaktion in der Exoduserzählung*. Untersuchungen zur Endredaktion des Pentateuch (FRLANT 186; Göttingen 2000) 314-315.

deutlich, dass der Hymnus Ex 15,2-18, den Davies selber als theologischen Höhepunkt von Exodus 1-18 betrachtet (er widmet ihm fast 90 Seiten und ihm allein einen eigenen Abschnitt „Theology“ (!), vgl. II, 283-371), eine Ergänzung zu den Quellenwerken darstellt, ohne dass Davies sagen kann, wer für den Einschub dieses gewichtigen Textes, der seiner Meinung nach aus der frühen Königszeit stammt (II, 309-311), verantwortlich gewesen sein könnte. Dass er das Moselied neben J, E und P sogar zu den vier großen Traditionselementen des Exodusbuches rechnet (I, 106), kann nicht darüber hinwegtäuschen, dass es dem Quellenmodell von Davies an konkreten Vorstellungen für spätere Redaktionen des Pentateuch mangelt. Ich hatte für die Einfügung aufgrund der Parallelität der Liedeinleitungen in Ex 15,1 und Num 21,17 und wegen des Ausblicks auf die Einwanderung ins gelobte Land den Hexateuchredaktor verantwortlich gemacht ⁷, aber ein solcher gehört für Davies offenbar in den Bereich der Spekulationen ⁸. Ähnliches gilt für die redaktionsgeschichtliche Beurteilung von Ex 13,5-16. Davies wehrt sich vehement gegen die These von Erhard Blum, dass ein spätdeuteronomistischer Redaktor (K^D) größeren Einfluss auf die Komposition des Pentateuch und damit auch des Exodusbuches gehabt haben könnte ⁹. Für Davies ist darum der Abschnitt in keiner Weise deuteronomistisch, sondern noch frühdeuteronomisch (II, 163-167). Aber auf die Frage, wer diese dtn. oder dtr. gestaltete Gesetzesparänese in die Quellenwerke eingeschoben haben könnte, bleibt er die Antwort schuldig. In einer früheren Arbeit hatte Davies die Itinerare des Exodusbuches zum großen Teil als deuteronomistisch bestimmt ¹⁰. Diese These hält er für Ex 12,27a; 13,20; 15,27; 16,1a; 17,1 weiter aufrecht (vgl. I, 104; II, 110-111) ¹¹. So kommt es zu dem merkwürdigen Befund, dass in einem Kommentar, in dem der Verfasser sonst eine zusammenhängende spät-dtr. Redaktion leugnet, ausgerechnet eine Kette von Wanderungsnotizen deuteronomistischer Herkunft sein sollen, die weder von ihrer Sprache, noch von ihrer Aussage her irgendwelche dtr. Merkmale erkennen lassen.

5. Zur Stützung seiner Entscheidung, für seinen Kommentar an der Drei-Quellentheorie festzuhalten, beruft sich Graham Davies auf ein berühmtes Votum von

⁷ Vgl. ALBERTZ, *Exodus I*, 235, 248-253; DERS., *Pentateuchstudien*, 456.

⁸ Die Einfügung des Mirjamliedes möchte Davies E zuweisen, obgleich sich das maskuline Pronomen *lāhem* „ihnen“ in Ex 15,21, das die Adressaten des Lobaufrufs bezeichnet, grammatisch und sachlich eher auf die im priesterlichen Vers 19 genannten Israeliten (von Davies als redaktionell eingestuft) als auf die Frauen von V. 20 bezieht (vgl. DAVIES, *Exodus II*, 371-376).

⁹ Vgl. E. BLUM, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch* (BZAW 189; Berlin 1990) 101-218, und DAVIES, *Exodus I*, 104-107; *Exodus II*, 159-160. Angesichts der beiden klugen und durchaus anerkennenden Besprechungen der Thesen Blums durch DAVIES (vgl. „The Composition of the Book of Exodus: Reflections on the Theses of Erhard Blum“, in M.V. FOX u.a. [Hg.], *Texts, Temples and Traditions. A Tribute to Menahem Haran* [Winona Lake, IN 1996] 71-85, und „KD in Exodus: An Assessment of E. Blum's Proposal“, in M. VERVENNE – J. LUST [Hg.], *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomistic Literature*. FS C.H.W. Brekelmans [BETHL 133; Leuven 1997] 407-420), hatte ich einen offeneren und kreativeren Umgang mit ihnen erwartet.

¹⁰ Vgl. G.I. DAVIES, „The Wilderness Itineraries and the Composition of the Pentateuch“, *VT* 33 (1983) 1-13. Die recht komplexe Argumentation ist aus heutiger Sicht keineswegs mehr zwingend.

¹¹ Einen weiteren kleinen dtr. Einschub sieht Davies in Ex 15,26 (*Exodus I*, 104). Eigentliche gehört der Vers mit dem von ihm E zugewiesenen V. 25b zusammen.

Ernest W. Nicholson: „Granted its shortcomings, [the Documentary Theory] remains the most comprehensive among all those that have recently be advanced as its replacement“¹². Dieses Urteil stammt allerdings schon aus dem Jahr 1998, als Davies seine Arbeiten am Kommentar begann; es kann heute kaum noch als aktuell gelten. Aber es regt zu der Frage an, ob Davies die „shortcomings“, d.h. die Mängel oder Schwächen der klassischen Quellentheorie, die Nicholson einräumte, hat vermeiden oder ausgleichen können. Als eine der Schwächen der Theorie könnte man sicherlich die sporadischen Nachweise für den Elohisten ansehen, die Davies damit zu beseitigen suchte, dass er dieser Quelle einen erheblich höheren Textanteil als üblich zuwies. Dabei kann man ihm zugute halten, dass er die Texte nicht, wie in der Quellenhypothese häufig geschehen, noch weiter aufgliederte, um möglichst überall Textanteile für J und für E reklamieren zu können. Stattdessen hat er in den Plage-Erzählungen die bisher für jahwistisch gehaltenen Partien großteils einfach zu elohistischen umfirmiert. Allerdings hat nach meinem Eindruck diese Neuausrichtung der Quellentheorie — bislang jedenfalls — für das Verständnis der Exodustexte wenig verändert. Nirgends arbeitet Davies einen spezifischen, etwa für das Nordreich typischen, zeitgeschichtlichen Verstehenshorizont für die elohistischen Partien des Exodusbuches heraus.

5.1. Doch trotz dieser Zurückhaltung bei der Textaufteilung, entgeht auch Davies nicht ganz dem alten Problem der Quellentheorie, Texte aus Systemzwang aufzuteilen, obwohl keine literarkritischen Gründe dafür vorliegen, oder literarische Brüche zu ignorieren, damit die Theorie stimmig bleibt. So teilt etwa auch Davies wie viele vor ihm Ex 2,11-22 dem Jahwisten zu, obgleich zwischen dieser Schilderung von Moses Aufstandsversuch bzw. seiner Flucht nach Midian und der dem Elohisten zugewiesenen Geburtsgeschichte (2,1-10) keinerlei literarische Unstimmigkeiten nachzuweisen sind. Der Grund liegt einfach darin, eine diachrone Erklärung für die unterschiedlichen Namen von Moses Schwiegervater — in 2,18 Reguel und in 3,1; 4,18 Jethro — zu liefern, unter der Voraussetzung, dass der Anfang (3,1) und der Schluss (4,18) der Erzählung von der Berufung des Mose wieder zum Elohisten gehörten. Doch stellt die alte Beobachtung, dass der in 2,23aa begonnene Erzählfaden vom Tod des Pharao, der in 4,19-20a unmittelbar aufgenommen wird, ernsthaft in Frage, ob die dazwischen stehende Berufserzählung auf der gleichen literarischen Ebene liegt wie die Erzählungen von Kap. 2. Dies würde allerdings die These von durchlaufenden Erzählwerken infrage stellen. So geht Davies noch einen Schritt weiter und gliedert 2,23aa aus der jahwistischen Partie aus, obwohl dessen temporale Einleitung fast wörtlich mit der von 2,11 übereinstimmt. Ziel dieser durch kein literarkritisches Kriterium gedeckten Operation ist es schlicht, den literarischen Zusammenhang zwischen 2,23aa und 4,19 undeutlich zu machen. Da 2,23aa nunmehr der Quelle E und 4,19,20a der Quelle J zugeordnet werden, stehen die beiden Passagen nicht mehr in einer Erzählfolge, sondern werden zu einer Art von Dublette (vgl. I, 193-218). Ähnliche fragwürdige, allein durch den Systemzwang der Quellentheorie begründete Textaufteilungen lassen sich an einer ganzen Reihe anderer Stellen nachweisen (so etwa die Aufteilung zwischen 7,16aa und V. 16aßb oder die Ausgliederung von 18,2b u.a.).

¹² E.W. NICHOLSON, *The Pentateuch in the Twentieth Century*. The Legacy of Julius Wellhausen (Oxford 1998) 195, so zitiert bei DAVIES, *Exodus I*, 84-85.

Der umgekehrte Fall, bei dem erkennbare grammatische Brüche im Text aus dem Interesse der Quellentheorie übersehen oder gar geleugnet werden, findet sich etwa in Ex 16,1. Im Jahr 2007 hat Ludwig Schmidt, übrigens ebenfalls ein Anhänger und Verteidiger der Quellentheorie, zutreffend herausgearbeitet, dass die Itinerarnotizen 15,27: „Sie kamen nach Elim [...] und lagerten dort am Wasser“, 16aα: „sie brachen von Elim auf“ sowie 17,1b: „und lagerten in Rephidim, aber es gab dort kein Wasser für das Volk zu trinken“ einen lückenlosen Erzählzusammenhang bilden¹³. Demgegenüber erweisen sich die Passagen von 16,1aβb „da kam die ganze Gemeinde der Israeliten in die Wüste Sin, die zwischen Elim und dem Sinai liegt [...]“ und 17,1a „da brach die ganze Gemeinde der Israeliten aus der Wüste Sin auf [...]“ als ein Einschub, mit dem P die Geschichte von der Speisung durch Wachteln und Manna und der Entdeckung des Sabbats in die ältere Genealogie eingehängt hat. Literarkritisches Kriterium sind für diese Textaufteilung nicht nur die plötzlich auftauchende priesterliche Terminologie („Gemeinde der Israeliten“), sondern auch die Tatsache, dass ein mit ungenanntem pluralischen Subjekt begonnener Satz durch einen mit ausdrücklich genanntem Subjekt fortgeführt wird. Diese Einsicht Schmidts würde allerdings bedeuten, dass das erst von P eingefügte Kap. 16 gar keine älteren Erzählquellen enthalten kann. Die wenigen nicht-priesterlich klingenden Verse (V. 4-5, 28-29) müssen nach-priesterliche Ergänzungen sein¹⁴. Dieser Konsequenz möchte Davies nun aber mit aller Kraft ausweichen: Er leugnet zwar nicht die priesterliche Terminologie in 16,1aβb; 17,1a, aber er möchte sie bloß als priesterliche Überarbeitung eines älteren durchlaufenden, nicht-priesterlichen Itinerars deuten und erklärt den Umstand, dass ein Subjekt erst im zweiten Satzteil benannt ist, zu einer auch sonst belegten Stilfigur (II, 435, 438-439). Doch zeigt eine genauere Durchsicht, dass zumindest drei der vier genannten Belege (Lev 1,1; Num 20,22; 2. Kön 19,36) ebenfalls von einer nachträglichen Bearbeitung des Textzusammenhangs herrühren.

5.2. Eine weitere methodische Schwäche der Quellentheorie besteht darin, dass sie aufgrund der Annahme durchlaufender Quellenwerke nicht wirklich untersucht, wo neue erzählerische Zusammenhänge beginnen und wie weit sie laufen. Davies betont zwar mit Recht, „that the factor of ‘narrative coherence’ (or connectivity) [...] also makes a valuable, indeed essential, contribution“ bei der Rekonstruktion der Quellen (I, 89), aber er wendet diesen Faktor nicht auf die Bestimmung kompositioneller Einheiten an. So kann er zwar angesichts der Geburtserzählung Ex 2,1-10 erstaunt bemerken, dass in den folgenden Kapiteln „nothing is made of Moses’ upbringing at the Egyptian court“ (I, 174); die ägyptische Prinzessin, die Mose aufzog, ist in den späteren Auseinandersetzungen mit dem Pharao vollständig vergessen. Aber weil für Davies der literarische Zusammenhang der durchlaufenden Quellenwerke feststeht, fragt er nicht weiter, ob die Exodusgeschichte nicht vielleicht aus kleineren, leicht divergenten kompositionellen Einheiten zusammengesetzt ist, worauf die Erzählkette von 1,15 – 2,23aα + 4,19-20a weisen könnte, die spätestens mit 4,24-26 abbricht. Davies hat recht, dass mit Kap. 5 eine neue Handlungskette beginnt, die über die Plagen bis zur Auszugserzählung 12,29-39* läuft und nur über die eigentümliche Vorausschau

¹³ L. SCHMIDT, „Die Priesterschrift in Exodus 16“, ZAW 119 (2007) 483-498, hier 484-486.

¹⁴ Ein Ergebnis, zu dem E. RUPRECHT, „Stellung und Bedeutung der Erzählung vom Mannawunder (Ex 16) im Aufbau der Priesterschrift“, ZAW 86 (1974) 269-307, aus anderen Gründen schon viel früher gelangt war.

in 3,18-20 mit dem Vorangehenden vorknüpft ist. Aber anders als er meint, schließt die erste Plagenerzählung mit 7,14-17 nicht direkt an 5,1-2 an, da zumindest Moses Weggang vom Pharao dazwischen hätte berichtet werden müssen. Vielmehr setzt die erklärende und tröstende Ansprache JHWHs an Mose das Scheitern der Verhandlungen von 5,3-20 voraus. So könnte eine sorgsame Untersuchung der Reichweite erzählerischer Zusammenhänge dabei helfen, quellentheoretische und kompositions- und redaktionsgeschichtlich arbeitende Ansätze einander anzunähern.

5.3. Die Quellentheorie litt lange unter dem Vorurteil, dass nach ihrem Entstehungsmodell, in dem die Priesterschrift schon ganz nah am Abschluss des Pentateuch zu stehen kommt, die nicht-priesterlichen Texte generell als vor-priesterschriftlich eingestuft wurden. Die teilweise in der neueren Pentateuchdiskussion verwendete Terminologie, dass nach-priesterliche Texte als „endredaktionell“ oder gar als „nachendredaktionell“ bezeichnet werden, geht noch auf diese alte Modellvorstellung zurück. Als „endredaktionell“ hatte Jan Christian Gertz z.B. die Passage Ex 3,12aß-15 eingestuft¹⁵, die aus der Moseberufung literarkritisch ausgrenzbare Namensoffenbarung, welche die deutlich klarer konzipierte Vorstellung einer erstmaligen Preisgabe des JHWH-Namens an Mose im priesterlichen Bericht (6,2-8) vorauszusetzen scheint. Dafür, dass Davies einer solchen nach-priesterlichen Ansetzung dieses zentralen Textes nicht folgen will (vgl. I, 268-269), mag man noch Verständnis haben, denn dies hätte sein Konzept vom Elohisten zu stark beschädigt. Weniger verständlich ist jedoch, warum Davies immer noch an der Zuschreibung von Ex 18 an den Elohisten festhält (vgl. II, 547-553, 579-589). Obgleich Davies die kompositorische Scharnierfunktion des Kapitels für das ganze Exodusbuch erkennt (18,1-12 blicken auf Exodus 1-17 zurück, V. 13-27 auf Exodus 19-24 voraus), die sonst kein weiterer elohistischer Text im Exodusbuch liefert, ist nun offenbar für ihn wieder das traditionelle Kriterium der Gottesbezeichnung ^{re}lohim entscheidend (im Kapitel 13-mal, neben 7-mal JHWH). Dabei sprengt es eigentlich schon die Annahmen der Quellentheorie, dass ein elohistischer Text wörtlich aus einem jahwistischen Text zitieren kann (18,3 = 2,22), und es bleibt höchst auffällig, dass das Kapitel sowohl vom vor-priesterlichen (17,1b.8; 19,2aa.b) als auch vom priesterlichen Itinerar (17,1a; 19,1.2aß) völlig übergangen wird. Eine nach-priesterliche Einordnung des Kapitels legt sich darum nahe. Wenn ich Exodus 18 erneut dem Hexateuchredaktor zuschreibe, der auch an anderer Stelle den Pentateuch kompositorisch strukturiert zu haben scheint¹⁶, so mag das für Davies absonderlich klingen („an odd point“ vgl. II, 586-587)¹⁷, aber wenn er sich einer nach-priesterlichen Ansetzung des Kapitels mit der Bemerkung zu entziehen sucht: „it has been moved from an original location elsewhere in the Pentateuch“ (II, 551), dann ist das reine Spekulation. So bleiben trotz aller Bemühung von Davies um eine Verbesserung der klassischen Drei-Quellen-Theorie auch in seiner Auslegung deren strukturellen Schwächen und Probleme weiterhin sichtbar.

¹⁵ Vgl. GERTZ, *Tradition*, 292-298.

¹⁶ Vgl. ALBERTZ, *Pentateuchstudien*, 456-457, 469-470.

¹⁷ Davies meint, die Hochschätzung des Midianiters Jethro passe nicht zum fremdenfeindlichen Josuabuch. Doch scheint er die Geschichte von der Hure Rahab übersehen zu haben (Josua 2). Sie hat als Ausländerin ebenfalls Israel unterstützt, und ihr wird ein ähnliches monotheistisches Gotteslob in den Mund gelegt (Jos 2,9aß-11) wie Jethro (Ex 18,10-11). Auch hier sehe ich den Hexateuchredaktor gestaltend am Werk, s. ALBERTZ, *Pentateuchstudien*, 463-468.

Ich komme zu meinem Gesamturteil: Trotz großer Gelehrsamkeit und beeindruckender Ausführlichkeit leistet dieser Kommentar mit seinen beiden vorgelegten Bänden nur einen relativ bescheidenen Beitrag zu einem besseren Verständnis der Texte der ersten Hälfte des Exodusbuches. In der Debatte um die Entstehung des Pentateuch stellt er keinen wirklichen Fortschritt dar, dazu ist er zu rückwärtsgewandt und zu apologetisch angelegt. Vielleicht wird er unter den Anhängern der Quellentheorie eine neue Debatte um den Elohisten auslösen. Möglicherweise wird er besonders den konservativen englischsprachigen Leserinnen und Lesern unter ihnen den Eindruck vermitteln, dass sie weiterhin die ihnen vertrauten Ansichten mit gutem Gewissen vertreten können. Aber auch denen, welche die literaturgeschichtliche Rekonstruktion, die Graham I. Davies vorgelegt hat, nicht für überzeugend halten, bietet dieser ausführliche Kommentar eine Fundgrube von Wissensbeständen aus ganz unterschiedlichen Bereichen, welche für ihre Auslegung des Exodusbuches nützlich sein könnten. Ganz im Sinne der Ziele dieser Kommentarreihe (deren einer Herausgeber Davies zur Zeit ist), „to bring together all the relevant aids to exegesis, linguistic and textual no less than archaeological, historical, literary and theological, to help the reader to understand the meaning of the books of the Old and New Testaments“ (I, xi), stellt dieser Kommentar ein fast unerschöpfliches Kompendium zum Exodusbuch dar. Dieses mit unermüdlichem Fleiß und großer Sorgfalt zusammengestellt zu haben, dafür sei seinem Autor herzlich gedankt.

Handschuhsheimer Landstr. 9/1
D-69120 Heidelberg

Rainer ALBERTZ

RECENSIONES

Vetus Testamentum

Liane FELDMAN, *The Story of Sacrifice. Ritual and Narrative in the Priestly Pentateuchal Source* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 141). Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2020. xiii-245 p. €104,00

Liane Feldman's monograph presents an innovative analysis of the Priestly traditions of the Pentateuch that reimagines the meaning of the ritual texts of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, their place within the literary history of the Priestly source (P), and the methods we use to study them. A sophisticated and well-crafted study totalling 200 pages, Feldman begins her book, in chapter 1 (pp. 1-28), by identifying three scholarly trends in earlier studies of P that she aims at displacing. First, Feldman criticizes the tendency of scholars to uncritically classify P's ritual laws as "nonliterary" (1) — dense, repetitive, and generally lacking in artistry when compared to the so-called narrative parts of P. Second, Feldman challenges the classic hypothesis that the earliest Priestly narrative (what Continental scholarship dubs "Pg") was largely devoid of cultic instructions and was only later edited to include the ritual laws of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers. Such a diachronic distinction between law and narrative, Feldman insists, fails to appreciate the integral role that the ritual texts play in advancing the overarching story of P, on the one hand, and the critical importance of narrative features in shaping the Priestly ritual texts, on the other. Third, Feldman maintains that much of the scholarship of P has operated from the reductionist premise that P's ritual instructions are only valuable for what they can tell us about how the cult functioned in ancient Israel. While Feldman concedes that P's rituals may resemble some of the rituals that were performed in Israel, she insists that the purpose of their textualization is not to codify actual practice. Rather, they serve the *literary* purpose of constructing a story world that conveys the importance of sacrifice for ensuring the successful functioning of the cult established at Sinai.

Feldman therefore argues that we should approach the Priestly ritual texts as literature, or what Feldman terms "literary ritual" (10). The four chapters that follow (Chapters 2-5) offer a close reading of Exodus 40 – Leviticus 7 (Chapter 2), Lev 8,1 – 15,33 + Num 7,1 – 8,4 (Chapters 3 and 4), and Leviticus 16–17 (Chapter 5), revealing how they serve to advance the plot, character development, and spatial setting of the Priestly narrative. The narrative coherence of Exodus 40 – Leviticus 17 and Num 7,1 – 8,4, Feldman contends, undermines scholarly attempts to posit major compositional breaks within these materials. While Feldman admits the presence of minor glosses and additions within P's ritual texts (for example, she concedes that the statement in Lev 1,4 that the burnt offering effects כפר is a late gloss [see 64 n. 96]), she argues that the vast majority of the instructions for the construction of the tabernacle and its sacrificial cult, the account of the

shrine's inauguration (including Num 7,1 – 8,4), as well as the instructions for blood ritual in Leviticus 16–17, belong to the earliest layer of P. One consequence of this argument is that Feldman denies a diachronic division between the ritual materials in Leviticus 1–16 and a later Holiness legislation that begins with Leviticus 17, although she leaves open the question of where Leviticus 18–27 fit within the compositional history of the Priestly traditions (see 193).

The concluding chapter (Chapter 6) summarizes the book's findings and explores what they reveal about P's implied reader. Feldman contends that P's "story of sacrifice" (199) intends to "democratiz[e] ... ideas about religious practice in ancient Israel" (198) by providing non-priestly members of the community imaginative access to the spaces and practices of the wilderness sanctuary. This democratizing tendency calls for a reassessment of whether P is a "priestly" text at all, insofar as the "choice to allow the reader-Israelite to hear and see the internal workings of the cult challenges the hegemony of the priesthood and centers the ordinary Israelite in the life of the cult" (198). Labelling the ritual laws "priestly legislation" (197) wrongly suggests that they were intended to "belong to one particular and exclusive group of Israelites" (198), such as the priestly scribes at Jerusalem, whereas Feldman concludes that P's ritual materials were intended for all Israel.

Feldman's study is original and ambitious, balancing methodological innovation with rich and detailed readings of the Priestly materials of the Pentateuch. Her argument is cogent and informed by a detailed engagement with the most recent scholarly works on P from North America, Israel, and Europe. Feldman's use of literary and ritual theory shows her mastery of tools and methods developed beyond biblical studies, but also her restraint in applying these theoretical lenses in a way that does not distort the biblical evidence. The clarity of her analysis is aided by elegant expression; this is an academic book that is a pleasure to read.

Certain aspects of Feldman's analysis might invite further discussion. For example, Feldman rightly criticizes the tendency for scholars to use "linguistic or stylistic criteria" (154) to identify supplementary materials in P without fully attending to narrative considerations. However, one might ask whether *The Story of Sacrifice* simply reverses the problem, such that "narratological solutions" (154) are invested with near-exclusive importance in identifying (or denying) redactional seams within the text. The danger here is that our ability to identify a certain degree of narrative logic in the placement of a particular text might lead us to uncritically assume that it was always part of P's narrative. In the case of the list of inauguration offerings at Num 7,1 – 8,4, for example, Feldman works hard to explain why this story makes sense within Pg even though it does not appear at "its chronologically appropriate location" (133) at Leviticus 8–9; she argues that Num 7,1 – 8,4 serve as a "flashback" (110) to the sanctuary inauguration, interrupting the account of the census and division of the wilderness camp in Numbers 1–10 to reinforce the importance of public offerings in the wilderness cult. Few could deny Feldman's point here — the placement of Num 7,1 – 8,4 is not entirely random or ill-considered. But does this prove that Num 7,1 – 8,4 are original Pg materials? Would the Priestly narrative lose coherence if Num 7,1 – 8,4 were excluded from its earliest layer? The problem is that later editors could, and certainly did, use narrative considerations to decide where to insert secondary additions; they did not simply lump all secondary additions together at the end of P as a series of addenda. The fact that narrative considerations informed how secondary layers were composed arguably suggests that the use of narratology

when making literary-critical arguments might be somewhat more complicated than Feldman admits.

Feldman demonstrates powerfully the methodological difficulty of moving from texts about the imaginary cult at Sinai to reconstructing historical realities in Israel. But does Feldman go too far when she claims that “[a] written text can reflect and construct only its own world. What exists only exists within the text, and not outside of it” (14)? Feldman states elsewhere that we cannot “ignore the sociohistorical context of [the Priestly] compositions entirely” (4), and she engages with extratextual evidence at certain points in her exegesis (see, for instance, her discussion of the role of animal sacrifice in providing meat in ancient societies, on 171). This would seem to suggest that the boundary between reading the Priestly rituals in their “own world” and reading them within the historical context of ancient Israel cannot be so neatly demarcated. In addition, it is somewhat unclear to what extent Feldman’s critique of labelling P as “priestly” means that she rejects the idea that the historical authors of P were priests. Such an idea would be difficult to substantiate. What other group in ancient Israel would have been capable of writing such detailed ritual instructions besides priests working within a temple institution?

Finally, Feldman does a particularly fine job in describing the literary means by which the reader is drawn into the spatial and performative world of the Priestly narrative, such that they gain literary access to spaces that would be otherwise inaccessible to non-priestly actors. But to what extent this amounts to a “democratizing” tendency, as Feldman claims, is open to debate. While P certainly confers ritual agency to the community, it also constructs a ritual world in which the people rely on the priesthood to sustain the cultic operations of the sanctuary. In the case of a text like Leviticus 16, it would be difficult to argue that the mere fact that P describes Aaron’s actions within the sanctuary, thereby making them known to non-priestly readers, undermines the clear *hierarchy* that the text enshrines between the people and the high priest, given that the success of the ritual depends entirely on Aaron’s ritual agency. Including such a lengthy text in P that describes in detail the intricacies of Aaron’s ritual actions within the sanctuary arguably *reinforces* the importance of the high priest as the leader of the community of Israel, because it enables the readers/hearers of the text of P to visualize the complexity and danger of Aaron’s ritual responsibilities within the sanctuary interior and thereby to appreciate the critical importance of this figure in the wilderness cult.

These remarks in no way deny the immense value of Feldman’s monograph for the study of P and for how we conceive of literary and ritual theory as contributing to biblical exegesis. They rather illustrate just how productive her book is for exploring key questions about the interpretation of P and the discursive purpose of its ritual materials. *The Story of Sacrifice* is an excellent book. It makes an impressive contribution to research on the Pentateuch that significantly advances how we understand the curious interweaving of “legal” and “narrative” materials within its sources. It will surely produce a rich and lively discussion about the meaning of the Priestly rituals and their contribution to the study of ancient Israelite religion and of literary production in antiquity more generally.

Harvard University
Cambridge, MA
U.S.A.

Julia RHYDER

Dorothee ZUNDLER, *Dekalog und Tefillin im Ijobbuch?* Eine sprach- und literaturwissenschaftliche Studie zu Ij 31 (Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament 107). Sankt Ottilien, Editions Sankt Ottilien, 2020. x-494 p. €39,95

„Ijob, dem trotz seiner Gottesfurcht alles genommen wird, wünscht sich, dass sein Klagen von Gott beantwortet wird. Denn seine Freunde sind überzeugt, dass sein Leid nur eine Folge von Sünde sein kann, und versuchen, ihn zu einem Geständnis zu bewegen. Ijob hält jedoch an seiner Unschuld fest und untermauert sie in einem ausführlichen Unschuldsbekenntnis, dem sogenannten Reinigungseid, in Ijob 31, der kontrovers diskutiert wird und zu Fragen Anlass gibt“ (so der Werbetext für den Buchhandel). Die umfangreiche Untersuchung des 31. Kapitels im Ijob-Buch wurde 2020 von der Kath.-Theol. Fakultät Würzburg als Dissertation angenommen; angeregt und betreut wurde sie von Hans Rechenmacher, einem der bedeutendsten Schüler von Wolfgang Richter.

Die Untersuchung ist in sieben Kapitel gegliedert: Die „Einleitung: Ij 31 und der Dekalog“ (S. 1-26) entfaltet kenntnisreich und breit belesen den aktuellen Forschungsstand zu Ijob 31 und begründet die spezifische Fragestellung, die zunächst und vor allem auf eine kritische Auseinandersetzung mit neueren Auslegungshypothesen abzielt: Lässt sich eine Beziehung von Ijob 31 zum Dekalog allgemein als Verinnerlichung und Vertiefung des Dekalogs (so v.a. Oeming) und noch mehr speziell als Schriftstück in Parallele zu den Tefillin (so Witte) wirklich behaupten? Es wird angekündigt, dass diese Sichtweise als unzutreffend widerlegt werden soll, weil „besondere Gemeinsamkeiten weder bezüglich Anzahl oder Reihenfolge noch in der Terminologie erkennbar“ seien (S. 8). Somit untermauert Vf. in die Kritik, die W. Rechenmacher schon geäußert hatte (vgl. Ders., *taw* und *sipr* in Ijob 31,35-37, in T. Seidl (Hg.), *Das Buch Ijob: Gesamtdeutungen, Einzeltexte, zentrale Themen* [Jahrestagung der Arbeitsgemeinschaft der Deutschsprachigen Katholischen Alttestamentlerinnen und Alttestamentler (AGAT) im August/September 2005 in Olmütz (Tschechische Republik)] (ÖBS 31; Frankfurt u.a. 2007) 165-180. Danach ist es „unwahrscheinlich, dass es in Ijob 31 plötzlich um Tora, Dekalog und Zugehörigkeit zu JHWH gehen soll, was das Ijobbuch die Fiktion von Ijob als Nichtisraelit bis zu dieser Stelle doch erfolgreich“ durchhalte (S. 7f.). Kap. „2. Konstitution des Textes“ (S. 27-82) führt über Transkription, Textkritik und Literarkritik zu einer Arbeitsübersetzung von Ijob 31. Kap. „3. Kritik des Einzeltextes (Textindividualität)“ (S. 83-300) führt ganz im Sinne der Richter-Schule und der Buchreihe eine minutiöse sprach- und literaturwissenschaftliche Analyse durch. Kap. „4. Kritik der Texttypik“ (S. 301-401) bietet eine Übersicht über Motive und Themen von Ijob 31, wie z.B. Bund, Tun-Ergehen-Zusammenhang, Wegmetaphorik, die Waage der Gerechtigkeit oder Körperbilder, die verschiedenen Traditionsbereichen gebündelt zugeordnet werden: ägyptische und israelitische Weisheitsliteratur, Klagelieder des Einzelnen und ägyptisches Totengericht. Kap. „5. Textverankerung und Textgeschichte“ (S. 402-411) bespricht überraschend knapp die Einleitungsfragen nach der Verankerung von Ijob 31 im Ijobbuch, nach Zeit und Raum der Textentstehung, dem soziokulturellen Kontext des Verfassers sowie der Textgeschichte. Kap. „6. Zusammenfassende Interpretation“ (S. 412-434) synthetisiert alle bisherigen Arbeitsschritte und bietet eine umfangreiche eigene These zu Inhalt, Sinn und Intention von Ijob 31 in seiner

Entstehungssituation und lotet unter der Überschrift „Tiefensemantik“ psychologische Erfahrungsstrukturen, Menschenbilder und Gottesbilder aus. Schließlich wird Ijob 31 in die alttestamentliche und altorientalische, bes. ägyptische Ethik eingeordnet. Diese 22 Seiten seien der Lektüre besonders empfohlen! Das abschließende Kap. „7. Dekalog und Tefilin in Ij 31?“ führt nochmals einen nunmehr tief fundierten Vergleich von Ijob 31 und dem Dekalog durch (vgl. auch die Übersichtstabellen auf S. 445-448, durch welche (angeblich) zahlreiche Widersprüche in den Deutungen von Oeming, Witte, Opel und Köckert aufgezeigt werden und die Vf.in zu dem negativen Resultat kommt, dass eben keine direkte Beziehung zum Dekalog vorliege. Ein umfangreiches Literaturverzeichnis (S. 458-492) sowie ein Abkürzungsverzeichnis (S. 493f.) beschließen die Arbeit.

Wenn ich (als einer der explizit Kritisierten) den Wert der Arbeit einschätzen soll, dann möchte ist klar unterscheiden hinsichtlich des hohen analytischen Aufwandes, den die Untersuchung sehr verdienstvoll leistet, und ihrer Gesamtthese. Vf. hat in fast allen Detailanalysen und Kontexterfassungen recht und ich kann ihr fast nur zustimmen. Aber im Gesamtverständnis hat sie unrecht und ich möchte ihr — wenig überraschend vielleicht — deutlich widersprechen. Ihr Urteil ist unzutreffend: „Sowohl die umfassende Analyse von Ij 31 als auch der Textvergleich zwischen Ij 31 und dem Dekalog sowie die Berücksichtigung entsprechender ethischer Texte anderer Kulturen kommen zu dem übereinstimmenden Ergebnis, dass Ij 31 weder den Dekalog rezipiert noch die Verwendung von mit Dekalogabschnitten beschrifteten Tefillin bezeugt.“ (S. 457). Besonders ist ihr Urteil problematisch, dass der nach meiner Sicht singuläre Spitzentext Ijob 31 keine besondere Bedeutung des Dekalogs in der Perserzeit und keine besondere Relevanz für die Entwicklung der Ethik belege. Man muss der Autorin zugestehen, dass sie diesen Sachverhalt klar herausgearbeitet hat, dass die Zuordnung zu den einzelnen Geboten schwierig und auch unter den Vertretern der These, dass Ijob 31 in die Rezeptionsgeschichte des Dekalogs gehört, (sehr partiell) kontrovers ist. Aber ich zumindest habe auch nirgendwo behauptet, dass dies anders sei. Natürlich ist z.B. „Du sollst nicht ehebrechen!“ formal und inhaltlich etwas Anderes als „Ich habe einen Bund für meine Augen geschlossen; wie könnte ich dann eine junge Frau anschauen?“ (Ij 31,1). Denn es handelt sich in Ijob 31 um einen *ausführlichen poetischen Text. Da ergeben sich andere Gesetzmäßigkeiten als bei extrem knappen Rechtsgerippe wie dem Dekalog. Der Verfasser von Ij 31 hat Freude daran und setzt seinen Ehrgeiz als Dichter darin, die Ideen des Dekalogs im Blick im Blick auf das eigene Seelenleben zu überprüfen („Beichtspiegel“), zu entfalten und moralisch zu überbieten.* Vf.in sieht dagegen eine andere Dynamik im Text: „Stattdessen greift der Verfasser auf ein typisch altorientalisches Motiv zurück, indem er Ijobs Streit mit Gott als gerichtliche Auseinandersetzung beschreibt. Ijob fasst sein Unschuldsbekenntnis in die juristische Form eines Reinigungsseids und sieht Gott sowohl in der Rolle des Richters als auch des Klägers. Das darin zum Ausdruck kommende ambivalente Gottesbild bezeugt eine besonders enge Beziehung zu Gott, die selbst in der größten Not-situation, die neben der eigenen Gesundheit und Existenz auch die grundlegenden theologischen Überzeugungen bedroht, nicht aufgegeben wird. Ijob setzt vielmehr seine gesamte Hoffnung auf die göttliche Rettung durch die richterliche Revision seines Urteils vom bestraften Sünder zum rehabilitierten Fürsten. Der Kontext des Ijobbuches zeigt: Je mehr Ijob an einen Rechtsstreit mit Gott

glaubt, desto hoffnungsvoller wird er — und das Ringen mit Gott in Ij 31 ist der Höhepunkt dieser Entwicklung hin zu Lebensmut, Hoffnung und Selbstsicherheit“ (S. 457).

Wie ist dieses Auseinandertreten von wertvoller filigraner Einzelexegese und Verkenntung der Gesamtintention zu erklären? Nach meinem Urteil verkennt Vf.in etwas sehr Grundsätzliches: Die *Lyrik* in Ijob 31 erschließt den Dekalog in einer anderen, tieferen Dimension. Dagegen hat Markus Witte in seinem großartigen Kommentar, *Das Buch Hjob* (ATD; Göttingen 2021), S. 485, in Kenntnis der Kritik nochmals gründlich Ijob 29-31 ausgelegt (S. 438-490) und nach meinem Urteil erneut überzeugend aufgezeigt: „Die ethischen Felder, die in Hi 31 angesprochen werden, haben [...] neben ihrer Verankerung in der weisheitlichen Ethik fast alle eine Parallele im Dekalog. Dass das Tötungsverbot nicht ausdrücklich erscheint, versteht sich angesichts der gesinnungsethisch und schöpfungstheologisch subtilen Stilisierung von Hi 31 von selbst Das Fehlen eines Pendants zum als genuin israelitisch anzusehenden Sabbatgebot (Dtn 5,12-15) ist typisch für weisheitlich geprägte Unschuldskennntnisse. [...] Mit anderen Worten: Hiob bekennt in Kap. 31 nicht nur, die zentralen Gebote der Torah und das hinter ihnen stehende Ethos gelebt, sondern dieses sogar übertroffen zu haben. Er tritt am Ende seines Bekenntnisses gleichsam mit der radikalisierten Torah als seinem „Zeichen“, das ihm Schutz bei der Begegnung mit Gott gewähren soll, Gott entgegen“. Ob Wittes Verbindung des Textes mit den Tefilin, d.h. den winzigen Schriftröllchen, die man als fast magische Schriftkompilation in den Mesusot seit Qumran nachweisen kann, zwingend ist, erscheint mir auch fragwürdig: „Konkret könnte dieses ‚Zeichen Hiobs‘ als eine Form eines sogenannten Phylakterions, d.h. eines Amuletts, verstanden werden“ (S. 485). Aber er formuliert im Konjunktiv. Aber davon abgesehen, wird sich die These einer tiefen Verbindung von Dekalog und Ijob 31 wohl doch weiter durchsetzen. Aber warten wir die Rezeptionsgeschichte von Dorotheas Zundlers Streitschrift ab.

Heidelberg

Manfred OEMING

Katharina LENTZ, *Crainte de Dieu, Sagesse et Loi. Aspects théologiques à partir de Si 10,19–11,6* (Septuagint and Cognate Studies 72). Atlanta, GA, SBL Press, 2020. x-351 p. 16 × 24. \$50,00

Lo studio di K. Lentz si estende su quattro ampi capitoli (che l'autrice chiama parti) e si concentra su tre temi fondamentali del libro di Ben Sira: timore del Signore, sapienza e legge. L'ordine nel quale compaiono i tre termini nel titolo è segno di una priorità riconosciuta al timore del Signore e pone il lavoro di K. Lentz sulla scia di quello di J. Haspecker, *Gottesfurcht bei Jesus Sirach*. Ihre religiöse Struktur und ihre literarische und doktrinäre Bedeutung (AnBib 30; Roma 1967), che identificava nel timore del Signore il tema principale del Siracide. In realtà, l'autrice evita di stilare classifiche e fa notare che l'eventuale primato del timore del Signore non è da intendersi in senso assoluto ed esclusivo, bensì a partire dalle relazioni che esso intrattiene con altri concetti, in primo luogo con la sapienza e la legge. Così facendo, K. Lentz offre un duplice e quanto mai opportuno contributo agli studi del Siracide: colma una lacuna

nella letteratura e, nel contempo, ad oltre 50 anni dallo studio di Haspecker, aggiorna la riflessione sul tema fondamentale del timore del Signore.

Dal punto di vista metodologico, seguendo una tendenza affermata nell'ultimo decennio, l'autrice considera i testi ebraico, greco, siriano e latino nelle loro specificità. Così l'analisi procede presentando non in sinossi, ma in successione le quattro versioni, riconoscendo a ciascuna una propria identità in relazione al contesto culturale che ne ha visto la genesi. Si cerca, ove possibile, di individuare i rapporti di dipendenza tra le quattro versioni, senza con ciò nutrire l'ambizione di rintracciare il testo originale. Alla fine dell'analisi si pongono a confronto le tradizioni testuali con lo scopo di evidenziarne le sfumature teologiche. Constatiamo tuttavia che, poiché non si dispone dell'ebraico dei brani più significativi per la trattazione (Sir 1-2 e Sir 24) e dato il carattere secondario di siriano e latino, di fatto le considerazioni teologiche si basano sul testo dei LXX.

Nel primo capitolo (13-103) l'autrice approccia la questione a partire da Sir 10,19 – 11,6, pericope assai poco studiata: si fa riferimento solo agli articoli di Di Lella (1982) e Gilbert (1996). Qui segnalo che, contemporaneamente a quello di K. Lentz, si è occupato della stessa pericope anche il mio studio: F. Savini, *"Quale pace tra il ricco e il povero?" (Sir 13,18b)*. Il binomio povertà — ricchezza nel libro di Ben Sira (AnBib 230; Roma 2020). Sir 10,19 – 11,6 presenta in stretta relazione timore del Signore, sapienza e legge, a partire dalla loro comune caratteristica di conferire onore agli uomini, ben oltre le qualificazioni economiche e sociali. Il riferimento al timore del Signore è il più esplicito ed esteso, seguito da quello alla sapienza, mentre il riferimento alla legge è in chiave negativa e puntuale (Sir 10,19). Al termine dell'analisi la differenza tra le versioni viene individuata nei diversi accenti: l'ebraico evidenzia la dimensione sociale, il greco quella religiosa; la versione siriana manifesta influenze ebionite e cristiane, mentre il latino accentua la trascendenza di Dio e il carattere retributivo del suo intervento. Il tema dell'onore, caro al Siracide, rivela una preoccupazione identitaria in relazione alla crescente influenza greca e ad un giudaismo sempre più chiamato a confrontarsi con una dimensione universale. Il brano analizzato, con l'accostamento di timore del Signore, sapienza e legge, apre la strada al resto della ricerca.

Il secondo capitolo (105-227) colloca la nozione del timore del Signore all'interno della tradizione biblica cui il Siracide si riferisce: si prendono in considerazione Deuteronomio, Salmi, Proverbi, Giobbe e Qoelet (105-123). Il Deuteronomio presenta ampiamente il concetto del timore del Signore, allontanandolo dal numinoso e inserendolo all'interno della relazione di alleanza tra Dio e il suo popolo: il timore del Signore è la risposta di adesione amorosa, fedele ed obbediente al Dio che si rivela nel dono della legge, vera sapienza di Israele; come tale esso è oggetto di insegnamento e di trasmissione. Nei testi sapienziali più antichi (Proverbi 10-30 e Giobbe) il timore del Signore ha soprattutto una valenza etica, mentre nei testi più recenti, influenzati dalla teologia deuteronomista, assume in modo più esplicito il riferimento alla legge e alla sapienza (Proverbi 1-9 e Giobbe 28), come accade anche nel Siracide. Dopo i Salmi il Siracide è il libro biblico in cui la nozione del timore del Signore è più presente; a questo punto K. Lentz, dopo alcune considerazioni di ordine lessicale (127-129), propone un'ampia rassegna (130-217) di tutti i passi del libro dove è presente il tema, con particolare attenzione a quelli in cui esso è posto in relazione con la sapienza e con la legge. L'analisi esamina le diverse tradizioni testuali

annotando le influenze cristiane percepibili nel siriano e nel latino. La maggiore densità di riferimenti al timore del Signore si trova in Siracide 1–2 e Siracide 17: a partire dallo studio di questo capitolo si apre un *excursus* dedicato al tema dell'alleanza eterna (Sir 17,12), che evidenzia l'orizzonte universale del discorso del Siracide (168-179). Dall'analisi emergono in primo luogo i forti accenti teologici (Siracide 1) e personali (Siracide 2); per quest'ultimo aspetto si sarebbe potuto far riferimento a N. Calduch-Benages, *En el crisol de la prueba*. Un estudio exegético de Sir 2,1-18 (ABE 32; Estella 1997). Dalla rassegna risulta che il timore del Signore nel Siracide è un tema fondamentale e complesso: esso è connesso non solo alla sapienza e alla legge, ma anche all'amore di Dio, ai profili della retribuzione, dell'onore, della gloria e ad altri valori morali e religiosi (fedeltà, giustizia, umiltà). Il ruolo cruciale del timore del Signore all'interno del libro di Ben Sira ne esce confermato; ma si conferma anche il fatto che non sia una nozione "isolabile": esso si può comprendere solo all'interno di una trama di relazioni con numerosi altri temi.

Il terzo capitolo (229-276) è dedicato allo studio della tematica all'interno di Siracide 1 e Siracide 24, testi chiave del Siracide, nei quali maggiormente emerge l'associazione di timore del Signore, sapienza e legge. Il legame tra legge e sapienza si trova già nell'iniziale inno alla sapienza (Sir 1,1-10), precisamente nell'allusione di Sir 1,10a e in modo esplicito nel GrII di Sir 1,5. Invece la profonda relazione che intercorre fra timore del Signore e sapienza emerge in Sir 1,11-30, dove le due realtà sono celebrate con sovrabbondante ricchezza di immagini. L'intreccio tra la dimensione universale della sapienza e la dimensione particolare del dono della legge, già presente in Siracide 1, torna in modo ben più esplicito in Siracide 24, dove si intrecciano i motivi sapienziali di Pro 8,22-31 con quelli deuteronomisti di Dt 4,6-8. Il celebre versetto Sir 24,23, identificando la sapienza con il libro della legge, mostra l'innovazione teologica del Siracide: si collega la teologia della creazione (sapienza), caratterizzata da un orizzonte universale, a quella della storia (elezione, alleanza, legge), caratterizzata dal riferimento a un popolo e a un luogo particolare (Israele e Gerusalemme). Nel quadro di un mondo giudaico sempre più confrontato con l'ellenismo, tale sviluppo teologico permette di presentare le tradizioni di Israele come un patrimonio universale, in grado di non soccombere di fronte alla sapienza greca. Poiché queste conclusioni scaturiscono dall'esegesi del testo dei LXX, sarebbe stato più prudente affermare che quella descritta è la posizione del Siracide nella diaspora alessandrina, piuttosto che quella dello scriba di Gerusalemme, come scrive l'autrice (276).

Nel quarto e conclusivo capitolo (277-302), sulla base delle analisi svolte, K. Lentz descrive il significato delle tre nozioni (timore, sapienza e legge) a partire dalle loro mutue relazioni. Mentre sapienza e timore del Signore si contendono il primato, la nozione della legge è meno presente nel Siracide ed è chiaramente subordinata alla sapienza: il riferimento alla legge è generale e i comandamenti compaiono non nella loro originale forma apodittica, ma in quella sapienziale dell'esortazione che fa appello alla ragione. In questo modo lo scriba, che aderisce senza riserve alla propria tradizione religiosa, propone la legge in una nuova veste sapienziale, collocandola in un orizzonte universale e inserendola all'interno dell'alleanza tra Dio e l'umanità; con ciò, pur mantenendo la propria identità giudaica radicata nella tradizione, egli getta un ponte tra giudaismo ed ellenismo. Il suo atteggiamento è aperto e non polemico, anche se apologetico. La stretta associazione fra timore del Signore, sapienza e legge non implica un'unica realtà

sotto tre differenti denominazioni, come suggerito da diversi autori; l'autrice si schiera con coloro che vedono nella semplice identificazione delle tre nozioni un tradimento del pensiero del Siracide. Quest'ultimo va preservato nella sua complessità. Infatti K. Lentz ritiene che la triade di timore del Signore, sapienza e legge nelle loro mutue relazioni, costituisca la specifica innovazione teologica del Siracide e auspica che venga ulteriormente esplorata e illustrata da nuovi studi.

Il libro aggiunge alla trattazione un'ampia sintesi in lingua inglese (303-331), nella quale si riesce ad evitare l'impressione di una semplice ripetizione di quanto già esposto. Questo riepilogo è apprezzabile non solo dal più vasto pubblico che fatica a leggere il francese; esso, infatti, consente a chiunque di orientarsi nella mole di testi analizzati, all'interno dei quali è facile smarrirsi anche a causa della veste grafica piuttosto piana adottata dall'editore.

L'opinione di chi scrive è che K. Lentz abbia apportato un solido contributo su un argomento che, ritenuto da tutti centrale, è stato accostato da molti, ma approfondito da nessuno a motivo della sua complessità, ulteriormente acuita dall'intricata situazione testuale. La forma interrogativa dei titoli del terzo e soprattutto del quarto conclusivo capitolo potrebbe suggerire che le questioni affrontate non abbiano trovato risposta, generando una certa delusione. In realtà lo studio di K. Lentz giunge a conclusioni sostanziose; il rapporto dinamico fra le tre nozioni risulta essere molto complesso, pertanto non può essere fotografato da nessuna definizione, ma, come è riuscita a fare brillantemente l'autrice, è rappresentabile attraverso un percorso che non recida, ma anzi valorizzi questa ricca trama di relazioni.

Via Abazia, 30
I-60033 Chiaravalle (AN)
dfsavini@gmail.com

Francesco SAVINI

Martin SCHOTT, *Sacharja 9–14. Eine kompositionsgeschichtliche Analyse* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 521). Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 2020. x-315 p. 16 × 23.5. €99,95

Die von H. Pfeiffer in Erlangen betreute Dissertation widmet sich dem schwierigen Textcorpus Sacharja 9–14 und seinem kompositorischen Ort zwischen Sacharja 1–8 und Maleachi 1–3. Eingeleitet wird sie im 1. Kapitel durch eine knappe, aber gehaltvolle Skizze der Forschungsgeschichte (1-17). Daraus ergab sich für den Autor im 2. Kapitel die Aufgabe, in einer ersten Orientierung der Frage nachzugehen, ob die „späten entstehungsgeschichtlichen Stadien Protosacharjas, deren theologische Tendenz und buchkompositorische Funktion“ (17) Hinweise auf einen Zusammenhang mit Sacharja 9–14 erkennen lassen (19-51). Dabei geht M. Schott davon aus, dass vor allem der sogenannte Epilog des Protosacharjabuches (Sacharja 7–8) von besonderer Bedeutung für die kompositorische Einbindung von Sacharja 9–14 gewesen sei. Im Ergebnis seiner Analyse zu Sacharja 7–8 kommt er zu einer überaus differenzierten Wachstumsgeschichte, die eine Grundschicht und fünf redaktionelle Fortschreibungen erkennen lasse. Diese Fortschreibungen enthielten in unterschiedlicher Weise Bezüge auf die epexegetischen Zusätze zu den vorausgehenden Nachtgesichten (Sach 1,1-6.7.14-17;

2,10-15; 4,6aß-10a*). Bereits diese Literargeschichte von Sacharja 7–8 sei ein Spiegel der »kontinuierliche(n) Auseinandersetzung mit der sacharjanischen Tradition der Perserzeit« (49), die in unterschiedlicher Gestalt und Intensität vom deuteriosacharjanischen Textcorpus aufgenommen und fortgeführt worden sei.

In den Kapiteln 3-6 der Untersuchung werden dann die vier Texteinheiten Sach 9,1 – 11,3; 11,4-17; 12,1 – 13,9 und 14,1-21 ausführlich besprochen. Den redaktions- und traditionsgeschichtlichen Analysen der vier Texteinheiten gehen stets einführende Bemerkungen zur »Gliederung«, eine knappe »forschungsgeschichtliche Orientierung« und eine ausführliche »kommentierte Übersetzung« voraus. Letztere bietet wertvolle Beobachtungen des Autors zur Textkritik, Semantik und Grammatik der einschlägigen Texte. In einem »Zwischenfazit« werden die Ergebnisse der Analysen zu den vier Texteinheiten präzise zusammengefasst und ihr »historischer Ort« bestimmt.

Für Sach 9,1 – 11,3 (untergliedert in 9,1-8.9-10.11-17; 10,1-2.3-12; 11,1-3) nimmt M. Schott eine vierstufige Wachstumsgeschichte an, wobei einzelne der Erweiterungsschichten noch einmal mehrere literarhistorische Fortschreibungen erfahren hätten. Ausgangspunkt und »Keimzelle« des Abschnitts sei die »Königsverheißung« in Sach 9,9-10 mit der Errichtung eines »eschatologischen Friedensreiches« als Fernziel gewesen (113). In drei Bearbeitungen sei diesem Kern erstens die Darstellung eines kriegerischen Umbruchs auf der syrisch-palästinischen Landbrücke vorangestellt worden. Eine zweite Fortschreibung habe die Kriegsdarstellung durch die Schilderung einer »göttlichen Defensivstrategie zum Schutz des Hauses JHWHs« ergänzt, wobei sich später in die »allgemeine Heilsstimmung« sukzessive »skeptische Untertöne« eingemischt hätten. Durch die dritte Fortschreibung erhielt die Texteinheit schließlich ihre Endgestalt mit einer »triumphalistischen« Schilderung des blutigen Krieges der »Söhne Zions« gegen die »Söhne Jawans«, der das erhoffte Heil herbeiführen werde (114-115).

Kompositionsgeschichtlich knüpfe Sach 9,1 – 11,3 mit seiner Königserwartung an Hag 2,20-23 an; mit der »Völkergerichtsthematik« werde auf Sach 2,10-13a; 7,14 Bezug genommen und mit dem »Jubelruf der Tochter Zion« auf Sach 2,14. Während Sach 9,9-10 als »messianische Summe« einmal den Abschluss des Epilogs von Sacharja 7–8 gebildet haben könnte (117), seien die »kriegerischen Passagen« die »markantesten Innovationen gegenüber Sach 1-8« (115-118). Historisch wird die Texteinheit mit ihren Bearbeitungen in der Zeit der Diadochenkriege (323-281 v.Chr.) verortet. Sach 9,1 – 11,3 reformuliere »die perserzeitlichen Hoffnungen des Zweiprophetenbuches (Hag und Sacharja 1–8) unter den Bedingungen der beginnenden hellenistischen Zeit« (121).

Als zweite Texteinheit wird die Rede über die treulosen Hirten in 11,4-17 (untergliedert in 11,4-14.15-16.17) untersucht. Für sie wird eine dreistufige Wachstumsgeschichte angenommen. Die Grundschrift habe in einem allegorischen Rückblick das Scheitern eines prophetischen Hirten geschildert. In einer ersten Fortschreibung wird ein »prophetisches Schauspiel in zwei Akten« inszeniert. Der erste Akt (11,4-14) symbolisiere als Zeichenhandlung die künftige »Preisgabe der Menschheit durch JHWH« und das Auseinanderbrechen von Juda und Israel. Der zweite Akt (11,15-16) »konterkariert messianische Hoffnungen« mit der »Erweckung eines Gegenmessias«. Durch eine zweite Fortschreibung (11,17) wurde schließlich das »Ende des schlechten Hirten« angesagt, das eine neue Hoffnungsperspektive eröffnet. Weitere »punktuelle Ergänzungen«,

enthielten Anklagen gegen die im Tempelbezirk agierende jüdische Führungsschicht, symbolisiert durch die »geldgierigen Schafhändler« (146-147).

Kompositionsgeschichtlich knüpfe 11,4-17 an Leerstellen in Sacharja 1-8 an. Wie einst die Väter in der Zeit des ersten Tempels nicht auf die Propheten gehört hätten (Sach 1,1-6; 7,7.12), so verwarfen sie auch die »wahren Hirten und Propheten« des zweiten Tempels (Haggai/Sacharja?) mit ihrer Heilsbotschaft. Die Folgen davon kommen in der doppelten Zeichenhandlung vom Zerschneiden der beiden Hirtenstäbe zum Ausdruck: Das Zerschneiden des Stabes »eines guten Hirten« symbolisiere »das verlorene Heil«, das »eines schlechten Hirten, das kommende Unheil.« Durch die redaktionellen Erweiterungen seien »entscheidende Aspekte der sacharjanischen Zukunftshoffnungen« widerrufen worden (148-149). Historisch stünden im Hintergrund die Wirren »der fortgeschrittenen Diadochenkriege« gegen Ende des 4. Jh. Das Zerschneiden der Bruderschaft zwischen Israel und Juda (Sach 11,14) verweise möglicherweise auf die mit dem Bau des perserzeitlichen Tempels auf dem Garizim beginnende und sich sukzessive vollziehende Entfremdung zwischen Judäern und Samaritanern (150-151).

Die dritte Texteinheit, Sach 12,1 – 13,9 (untergliedert in 12,1.2-8; 12,9 – 13,1.2-9) enthalte »vier sukzessive gewachsene Blöcke«. Im ersten Block (12,2-6*) fordert JHWH zum vergeblichen Völkersturm auf Jerusalem auf. Im zweiten Block (12,9 – 13,1) bewirkt die Ausgießung des »Geistes des Erbarmens« JHWHs die Reue der Jerusalemer »über die Ermordung seines (letzten) prophetischen Repräsentanten«. Der dritte Block (Sach 13,2-3) kündigt die Reinigung des Landes von falschen Propheten an, die den Götzen und der Lüge dienen, und daher wie der ermordete Durchbohrte in 12,10 enden werden. Der vierte Block (13,7-9) sagt schließlich ein Vernichtungs- und Läuterungsgericht an, dem nur ein Drittel des Volkes entgeht. Zwei Einschreibungen (projerusalemisch: 12,2b.5.8. / projüdisch: 12,4b.6a.7) und eine nachgetragene »Prophetengroteske« gaben dem Abschnitt seine Endgestalt (194-195). Im Hintergrund der gesamten Komposition 12,1 – 13,9 stehe die in 11,4-17 sich andeutende Krise und ihre Überwindung, wobei sich im ersten Block (12,2-6*) der »Zusammenbruch der persischen Weltordnung« abzeichne (196).

Als letzte komplexe Texteinheit wird Sach 14 (untergliedert in 14,1-11.12-21) untersucht. Der älteste literarische Kern des Kapitels lasse sich in 14,1-2* festmachen, einem Wort über den »Tag JHWHs« als einen von JHWH initiierten Angriff der Völker auf Jerusalem. In einer ersten Fortschreibung sei diese Ankündigung des »Tages JHWHs« dann erweitert und durch steigende Ausmalungen in einen Gerichtstag über die Völker umgearbeitet worden, so dass jetzt das »Völkergericht als Antithese dem Völkerangriff« gegenüberstehe. Eine zweite Fortschreibung habe schließlich diesen »Tag JHWHs« als »Tag eins« der weltweiten Königsherrschaft Gottes interpretiert, die sich in einer Neuschöpfung sowie der Völkerwallfahrt zum Zion manifestiere (234-235).

Kompositionsgeschichtlich lasse sich Sacharja 14 als ein »Doppelgänger« zu Sach 12,2 – 13,9 bestimmen. Während in 12,2 – 13,9 »die inneren Vorgänge der Umkehr, Reinigung und Läuterung des Gottesvolkes« am »Tag JHWHs« thematisiert werden, beschäftige sich Sacharja 14 mit den »äußeren Vorgängen in der Natur und Völkerwelt« (235). Damit zeichne sich für Sach 12,2 – 14,21 eine in drei Phasen erfolgende Wachstumsgeschichte ab, die das wechselvolle Verhältnis JHWHs und Jerusalems zu den Völkern thematisiere: 1. Völkerangriff auf die Gottesstadt Jerusalem, 2. Völkergericht und Läuterung des Gottesvolkes und

3. Völkerwallfahrt zum Laubhüttenfest nach Jerusalem (236-237). Als historischer Ort für diesen Wachstumsprozess lasse sich die Epoche von der Eroberung Jerusalems durch Ptolemaios I. (302 v. Chr.) mit den folgenden Diadochenkriegen wahrscheinlich machen.

Im 7. Kapitel präsentiert der Verfasser eine Synthese seiner Untersuchungen. Zunächst zeichnet er in eindrücklicher Weise die inhaltlichen Hauptlinien von Sacharja 9–14 nach. Diese lassen »Zwei Zukunftsszenarien« erkennen. Das erste, deuteriosacharjanische Szenario (9,1 – 11,3) sei mit der Erwartung eines Königs (9,9) restaurativ auf die Wiedererrichtung eines aus Juda und Efraim/Israel bestehenden Großreiches ausgerichtet gewesen. Im zweiten tritosacharjanischen Szenario (12–14) sei es um eine letzte Entscheidungsschlacht zwischen Jerusalem und den Völkern am »Tag JHWHs« gegangen, die in ihren kosmischen Dimensionen Abschied von der restaurativen Hoffnung auf eine Erneuerung des weltlichen Königtums nahm. An seine Stelle trete die »Königsherrschaft JHWHs über die ganze Welt«. Beide gegenläufigen Szenarien seien durch eine prophetentheologische Metaerzählung (10,1-2; 11,4-17; 12,9 – 13,9) miteinander verwoben worden (243-244), wobei vor allem 11,4-17 eine Art Scharnier bilde. Einerseits schaue es auf das Scheitern der restaurativen Heilserwartungen in 9,1 – 11,3 zurück und andererseits biete es eine Vorausschau auf den in 12–14 geschilderten universalen Umbruch (247). Schließlich wird das vielschichtige literarische Wachstum der beiden Hauptteile noch einmal in einer Übersicht zusammengestellt (248-253).

In der abschließenden Skizze über die Stellung von Sacharja 9–14 im Dodekapropheten, werden die Kapitel in die Geschichte der Prophetie eingezeichnet (256-257). Mit dem Wiederaufleben der Prophetie in der nachexilischen Zeit (Haggai und Sacharja 1–8) habe sich durch die Warnung vor den falschen Propheten (10,1-2) und die Tötung eines wahren Propheten (11,4-17*; 12,10) die Gewissheit durchgesetzt, dass die Prophetie allmählich an ihr Ende gekommen sei (13,2-3). Mit Mal 1,1 werde schließlich Maleachi als letzter paradigmatischer Gestalt eines Propheten das Wort erteilt (262-264).

Die vorliegende Untersuchung stellt ohne Zweifel einen Gewinn für die weitere Arbeit an Sacharja 9–14 dar. Die künftige Forschung wird sich den Textanalysen von M. Schott stellen müssen. Dabei dient ihm seine überaus differenzierte Nachzeichnung des redaktionsgeschichtlichen Werdegangs der Texte dazu, ihre Kompositionsgeschichte zu erhellen. Ob sich allerdings seine in vier und mehr Schichten ausdifferenzierte Redaktionsgeschichte der Texte in jedem Fall bewähren wird, das bleibt weiteren Untersuchungen zu Sacharja 9–14 vorbehalten. Zwar argumentiert der Autor bedacht und formuliert seine Annahmen in der Regel im Konjunktiv. Bei fortlaufender Lektüre stellt sich allerdings mitunter der Eindruck ein, dass dabei eine hypothetisch postulierte Redaktionsschicht auf der jeweils vorausgehenden aufbaut. So leuchtet es zum Beispiel wenig ein, dass Sach 9,9-10 einmal ältester literarischer Kern von 9,1 – 11,3 gewesen sei und ursprünglich den messianischen Schlusspunkt hinter Sacharja 8 gesetzt haben könnte. Dass im Sacharjaepilog (Sacharja 7–8) kein messianisches Votum mehr zu finden ist, hat wohl eher etwas damit zu tun, dass das Thema mit Sach 6,9-15 vorläufig als beendet galt. Auch die literarkritische Differenzierung zwischen 12,1a und b überzeugt nicht wirklich. Dass 12,1a mit dem Adressaten »Israel« auf einer redaktionsgeschichtlichen Ebene mit 14,1-2 liegen soll, scheint mir angesichts der Jerusalemzentrierung von Sach 14 unwahrscheinlich. Vielmehr

orientiert sich 12,1a wohl eher an 9,1b und markiert damit zwischen Sacharja 9–11 und 12–14 die entscheidende Zäsur zwischen dem deuterio- und tritosacharjanischen Textcorpus. Daher auch die überladen wirkende »doppelte Überschrift« in 12,1, die bei Lichte besehen ja keine wirkliche Doppelung darstellt, sondern das Wort JHWHs an Israel protologisch untersetzt. Die beiden Rückfragen mögen genügen, um deutlich zu machen, wo die Probleme einer zu hypothesenfreudigen Redaktionskritik liegen. Letztlich stellt sich immer die Frage nach der Tragfähigkeit der literarkritischen Kriterien, die zur Anwendung kommen. So ist es — um nur ein Beispiel zu nennen — problematisch, wenn der Verfasser den mehrfachen unvermittelten Wechsel von der Prophetenrede in die Gottesrede einmal zum rhetorischen Stilmittel erklärt (92) und ein anderes Mal als literarkritisches Kriterium in Anwendung bringt (99).

Die wenigen Rückfragen wollen den Wert der vorgelegten Studie in keiner Weise schmälern. Der Verfasser hat sich mit großer Umsicht einem der schwierigsten Texte des Prophetenkanons gewidmet. Mit seinen scharfsinnigen Detailbeobachtungen sowie der konzeptionellen und argumentativen Stärke zur Kompositionsgeschichte hat er die Debatte zu Sach 9–14 bereichert und innovative Impulse für weitere Untersuchungen gegeben.

Leipzig

Rüdiger LUX

Novum Testamentum

Mar PÉREZ I DÍAZ, *Mark, a Pauline Theologian. A Re-reading of the Traditions of Jesus in the Light of Paul's Theology* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 521). Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2020. xvi-298 p. 15.5 × 23.5. €84,00

The similarities between the theology of Mark's Gospel and that of the Apostle Paul have been noted for centuries. Both employ the word "gospel" to characterize the essential Christian message (Mark 1,1; 14,9; Rom 1,1.16); both have an unrelenting focus upon the death of Jesus; both are strongly marked by key features of Jewish apocalypticism (dualism, conflict with the demonic, doctrine of the two ages); both share a similar conviction regarding the abrogation of the Jewish law. These and many other points of comparison that have been proposed have led to the suggestion of Pauline influence on the composition of the Second Gospel. The suggestion received a firm and, in the view of many, definitive "No" in the monograph of Martin Werner, *Der Einfluss paulinischer Theologie im Markusevangelium* (Giessen 1923), who claimed that the similarities and coincidences between the two simply reflected a common dependence upon the early Christian tradition. This negative judgment has not, however, won the field. The case for Pauline influence on the Gospel of Mark has been revived by Markan scholars of the eminence of W. Marxsen, E. Schweizer, C. Clifton Black, and others. Joel Marcus provides a balanced summary of the situation in the first

volume of his Anchor Bible Commentary on the Gospel of Mark (*Mark 1–8* [New York 2000] 73–75).

The Catalan scholar Mar Pérez i Diaz (PiD) is thus entering a contested and well-populated field in renewing the case for Pauline influence on the Second Gospel. Her aim is “to search for and analyse passages in Mark’s Gospel that are distinctly Pauline in theology, or are in harmony with Paul’s thought or those in which the evangelist has independently echoed Pauline ideas” (2). The hope is “to find out whether the evangelist, when composing, organising and writing his narrative, had in mind the theology of Paul as a key to interpreting the words and deeds of Jesus of Nazareth” (2–3). The intent is to “show how the evangelist Mark reworked and changed the sources he received so that they are in agreement with Paul” (4). These are ambitious aims indeed — not least because of the difficulty, unique to Mark, of identifying pre-existing sources so as to be in a position to assess the extent of any proposed alteration in a Pauline direction. Acknowledging (rightly in my view) that Mark was the creator of the literary “form” gospel (though “genre” would be a more appropriate term), the author argues that the structure given to the gospel is “the cohesive element making the whole narrative Pauline in character” (4).

As regards methodology PiD signals an intent to use both a historical-critical and narrative, synchronic approach (6). The force of the argument rests not so much upon a few common elements but “through the weight of cumulative evidence provided” (6). PiD acknowledges that it is “a difficult and complex task to discover the author’s intentions” (7). Hence the “argument will be based on the distinctive Pauline structure of the Gospel devised by Mark, as well as on [...] passages whose intentionality is manifestly comparable to other passages in Paul’s writings and in which the teaching arising from both texts requires joint interpretation” (7). This is all very well, but what one misses here, from a methodological point of view, is a discussion of *criteria* whereby one may assess what is an example of Pauline influence and the *degree* of certainty with which one may make such an assessment in any particular case. One thinks here of the exemplary methodology in an analogous area (intertextuality) presented by Richard Hays in his classic work, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven, CT – London 1989) esp. 25–33.

Following an outline of the history of research on the topic (chapter one), PiD discusses the structure of the gospel as created by Mark (chapter two), arguing that its focus upon the cross throughout and its climax in the confession of Jesus as Son of God by the Gentile centurion precisely at the moment of deepest humiliation harmonise closely with 1 Cor 1,18–25 (43). A very long third chapter, constituting in fact the bulk of the work (45–190), examines Pauline theological elements within the Gospel of Mark: the meaning of the word εὐαγγέλιον; the motif of misunderstanding on the part of those around Jesus (disciples, especially Peter; the family of Jesus); controversies arising out of Jesus’ questioning of the Law, especially the subject of purity; the second account of the multiplication of the loaves in order to provide a pattern for the mission to the Gentiles; the replacement of the Temple; relationship with Roman authorities; the death, and resurrection of Jesus; and the place of women in both the Gospel and the letters. The fourth chapter is devoted to Christology, discussing in particular whether there is a corrective aspect in Mark’s presentation of the suffering of Jesus, the key titles, the conflict with the demonic, the significance of the fulfilment of

Scripture. PiD concludes (243) that Mark's Christology is that of "one who has grasped the essence of Paul's thought, although [...] often expressed in language and terminology not found in Paul" (243). In a final chapter (5), the author concludes from the foregoing investigation that the Gospel of Mark is a Pauline interpretation of the gospel tradition, not limited to a few expressions, words, or doctrine but "reflected in the general intention of the evangelist when he structures his narrative by looking at the cross [...] turning upside down the concept of the Messiah expected by Israel, in accordance with Paul (251). Thus, "[t]he large number of indications in Mark's narrative that converge with Pauline theology cannot be the result of chance, but of the will of the evangelist Mark to harmonise his work with the thought of the apostle Paul" (252).

Pérez i Díaz is clearly very much at home in the Gospel of Mark and brings to the work a very comprehensive grasp of the relevant secondary literature — not only in English and German but in French, Spanish, and Italian as well. The work will serve well readers wishing to update themselves on recent interpretations of Mark from a broad international perspective. The expertise on Mark, however, is not matched in regard to Paul. Again and again, especially in the long third chapter, discussion of Mark at considerable length and depth concludes with brief references to Paul, some of which are so generalised as to add little weight to the case for *influence* on the Gospel, as distinct from similarity. For example, to maintain that "Mark, in a very Pauline way but in narrative form, speaks of justification by faith, as Paul does in Romans" (60) in his depiction of the difficulty the disciples have with aspects of the teaching of Jesus and especially his destiny to suffer, is not convincing when one considers both the weight and specific focus of this motif in Paul. A further comparison (181) in regard to the faith of the woman with a haemorrhage (Mark 5,25-34) is prone to the same weakness. Jesus' declaration, "all foods clean", in Mark 7,19 has long been considered a key point of contact with Paul's observation, "nothing is unclean in itself", in Rom 14,14. But PiD strangely argues (149) that "the Marcan Jesus had declared all foods clean (7.19) and this made it possible to share the table", and then goes on to say, "[t]herefore, the words of Mark 7.19 reflected the Pauline mission and prefigured the mission to the nations, free from the Law as Paul himself states in Romans 14". But it was not a declaration on the part of the *Marcan* Jesus that made possible the Pauline sharing of tables at some stage post-Easter; it would have had to have been the *historical* Jesus, since Mark's Gospel postdates Paul.

Even in the Marcan area one comes across some odd statements. It is true that Mark and Paul cohere in regard to the exercise of divine power in human weakness, and do so especially in regard to the passion and death of Christ. But while "God may be at work on the cross of Jesus (1 Cor 2,7-8; Mark 14,21, 61-63)", how does this justify going on to say, "God, therefore, has been crucified" (169). (One wonders on meeting such statements whether the English translation [which on the whole reads well] has been faithful to the Catalan original).

Some statements in the Pauline area are quite wrong. It is not true that "unlike Mark, Paul speaks of Jesus from, and only from, his resurrection" (223). Paul may reflect on Jesus entirely from faith in the resurrection (Gal 1,16) but — *pace* 2 Cor 5,16b (a text curiously neglected in the work) — the obedience displayed in his historical life (Rom 5,19; Phil 2,8) is central to Pauline soteriology. Neither in Rom 5,12-21 nor in 1 Cor 15,45-50 does Paul make any mention of demonic

influence on the sin of Adam (228-229) in a way comparable to the demonic assault on Jesus in Mark 1,12-13, and reference to the demonic in Phil 2,9-11 and Rom 8,38-39 is, at best, so implicit that to find Pauline influence on Mark here (234) very questionable.

Accessing the “intention” of an author is problematic in any case but especially so when one is trying to get behind the actual text to discover what may have been influences consciously brought to bear upon it. Mark is likely to have been familiar with the letters of Paul and to have found his theology highly relevant to the audience he had in mind. Perhaps we should rest content to say that his invention of the gospel genre was a most fitting complement to the gospel emerging from the letters rather than something that reflected the latter in the degree that the present author maintains.

175 Royal Parade
Parkville, Victoria
Australia 3052

Brendan BYRNE, SJ

Marco ROTMAN, *The Call of the Wilderness*. The Narrative Significance of John the Baptist’s Whereabouts (Contributions to Biblical Exegesis & Theology 96). Leuven, Peeters, 2020. xv-306 p. 15 × 23. €68,00

The descriptions of John the Baptist in the four canonical gospels and in Josephus’s *Jewish Antiquities* reveal different details about this figure. One response to these differences is analyzing them in hopes of reconstructing the historical figure of John the Baptist. Another response is to consider the purpose of the details found in each writing for that work. In this revised dissertation from Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Marco Rotman chooses the latter path and uses a narrative-critical approach to determine how the geography and location of the Baptist connects to a writing’s characterization of John and other key themes.

The opening chapter (1-35) offers an overview of relevant research and methodological considerations. Rotman succinctly explores how previous studies have focused on historical questions about the location of John the Baptist’s ministry and death. The rise of narrative-critical methods and recent attention to the role of geography in narrative open up new angles for study, with Rotman specifically employing the concept of “thematized space” developed by Mieke Bal and Marie-Laure Ryan. Such an approach does not find significance in all settings nor does it maintain that every possible background is evoked. It instead finds geographic settings to have symbolic significance that the reader should take into account when the text gives indications that it draws upon previous knowledge about geographical realities or textual traditions associated with the area.

The second chapter (37-65) explores geographical realities and textual traditions about the Jordan Valley to find *potential* backgrounds a narrator may utilize, challenging various common assumptions about the region in the process. Rather than being a “deserted” or desert-like place, this area included a “lush green valley” and featured cities with vibrant commercial and agricultural activities. The Jordan River also does not appear to be a dividing line at the time between Jewish and Gentile territories and seems easy to cross. While

many have made connections to John's ministry at the Jordan and the crossing of the river under the ministry of Joshua, this is far from the only or dominant image found in Old Testament traditions; it was also the place of judgment (Sodom), divine provision and renewal (Elijah and Elisha narratives), and eschatological restoration (Ezekiel's vision).

Rotman applies this background information to the geographical location of the Baptist in texts generally held to be from the first century CE: Mark (ch. 3), Q (ch. 4), Matthew (ch. 5), Luke (ch. 6), the Gospel of John (ch. 7), and Josephus (ch. 8). After addressing special issues related to each examined text (e.g., the reconstruction and study of Q; the connection between the infancy narratives and the rest of Luke; the authenticity and sources of Josephus), he offers an overview of the Baptist in that work and then studies that text's geographical settings pertaining to him. The analysis reveals each document using the setting of the Baptist in unique ways to serve its purposes.

In his examination of Mark (67-95), Rotman argues that John's geographical locations develop the theme of John as forerunner who is subordinate to Jesus. John ministers in Judea and is executed in Galilee, while Jesus ministers in Galilee and is executed in Judea, with Jesus surpassing John since Jesus is to appear alive again in Galilee, the place where John died. While many have sought to view John's location in the wilderness as part of an idea of a New Exodus, Rotman does not see connections in the text to that theme, viewing a link to Elijah and eschatological renewal to have stronger grounding.

Rotman's findings in Q (97-118) are more cautious in light of the tenuous nature of a reconstructed text. He disputes the reference to "the environs of the Jordan" in 3,3 being in Q. Overall, he notes that John's wilderness setting contributes to the ambiguous judgment about the Baptist in the work as one who stands with Jesus but also outside the kingdom, as significant events happen in the wilderness, but it is not the place to go to seek the kingdom.

The investigation of Matthew (119-139) highlights a special connection between John and Judea. This connection begins with the uniquely Matthean placement of John in "the wilderness of Judea", a region Rotman argues includes land both east and west of the Jordan in the narrative. While Matthew does not give a particular location for John's execution, Rotman believes the reader would view it as Judea since the narrative associates Herod with this area and includes Perea in Judea. This placement of John in Judea shows it as a hostile place to which Jesus will journey from Galilee and be executed.

Rotman finds the various locations of the Baptist in Luke to reflect key components of its characterization of John (141-166). The announcement of his birth in the temple and birth in the hill country of Judea connects John to the Old Testament while also creating a way for Jesus to surpass John since the temple is Jesus's home and his place of birth fulfilled messianic prophecy. John then travels to the wilderness, which shows him as a prophet to announce salvation. The movement of John to the Jordan area that Luke describes places him at the beginning of the time of salvation.

The discussion of the Gospel of John (167-199) contends that the text presents both locations of John's ministry (Bethany beyond the Jordan, and Aenon near Salim) as outside of Judea. This is significant since it means that John ministers outside of Judea while Jesus ministers in Judea, the home where he is rejected (see John 1,11). This geographical distinction coheres with the idea of John as a

witness to Jesus who points away from himself to Jesus, as he does not enter into the land of Jesus's ministry.

Rotman's analysis of Josephus (200-229) finds that the description of John's death at the fortress Machaerus, located at the border of Perea and Nabatea and symbolizing his power, has literary significance. Herod's actions there display his lawlessness, with Herod experiencing defeat by the Nabatean king Aretas after John's death. It is thus a fitting location for Herod to receive the divine recompense that Josephus highlights throughout his work. Rotman devotes significant space to discussing the concept of wilderness prophets discussed in Josephus, showing this categorization to be a scholarly construction rather than a theme in the text since each figure has its own role. While this section may not have a significant connection to the overall thrust of the work, it is a helpful contribution to an ongoing debate.

The final chapter summarizes the findings of the work as well as ideas on future research using his methodology, other texts discussing John, and historical study of the Baptist (231-242). An extensive bibliography (243-283) reflects the thoroughness of the research of this work. Indices of ancient sources (285-296) and modern authors (297-306) enhance the usefulness of this volume; while a subject index could help readers looking for particular issues, the work is well-structured so one can find particular topics of interest by examining the table of contents and index of sources.

Rather than quibbling about particular details or interpretations, I would like to highlight two issues that seem worthy of deeper exploration, one concerning content and one methodology. In terms of content, the work focuses upon passages where the Baptist appears or where he is described as being in a particular place, but there could also be value in examining locations where his name is evoked or he is remembered, such as the appearance of disciples only familiar with the baptism of John in Ephesus in Acts 19,1-7, or the Synoptic discussion of John's authority in Jerusalem (Matt 21,23-32; Mark 11,27-32; Luke 20,1-8). Do the locations and settings of these references have significance for the portrayal of John and his role in the narratives? Methodologically, the work seems to presume that the reader has little or no knowledge about the Baptist. However, the abrupt introduction of John into the narratives and the transmission of traditions within circles of followers of Jesus may indicate they already possessed some knowledge about John and his ministry; this could be part of the encyclopaedia in interpreting the text. Would knowledge of the Baptist from other sources call into question potential interpretations of the text given in this work or offer new insights concerning the claims of a text? While both of these suggestions may stand a bit outside of this work due to the methodology it employs, they would seem to build upon the findings and integrate the method with other insights and approaches.

As a well-researched, well-written, and well-argued study, this monograph has value on multiple fronts. Future study of the Baptist should interact with the work's discussion of particular texts as well as the implications it raises concerning the use of these texts for historical reconstructions of John. Its use is not limited to the study of the Baptist or the Jordan Valley, as it challenges common claims in other areas such as the concept of wilderness prophets in Josephus and the New Exodus theme in Mark. The methodology employed seems translatable to other figures and aspects of the texts, so others should continue to utilize and

refine it over the years. In fact, this work could serve a purpose like that of the Baptist in the Gospels, paving the way for further work that advances it even further.

Faith Church
100 81st Ave
Dyer, IN 46311 USA
Brian_Dennert@yahoo.com

Brian C. DENNERT

Johanna KÖRNER, *Sexualität und Geschlecht bei Paulus*. Die Spannung zwischen »Inklusivität« und »Exklusivität« des paulinischen Ethos am Beispiel der Sexual- und Geschlechterrollenethik (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 512). Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2020. xiii-332 p. 15.5 × 23. €84,00

Johanna Körner untersucht die einschlägigen Texte zum Thema Sexualität und Geschlecht bei Paulus mit deren jüdischen und hellenistisch-römischen Kontexten, um das spezifische Profil paulinischer Ethik im „Koordinatensystem“ (296-297) seiner jüdischen Herkunftstradition herauszuarbeiten. Zur komplexen Gesamthematik bietet sie eine nützliche Orientierung und Zusammenstellung, gut strukturiert, umsichtig und verständlich argumentierend.

Wie Körner in der Problemstellung der Einleitung (Kapitel I) umreißt, geht ihre Heidelberger Dissertation (im Rahmen des DFG-Forschungsprojekts „Ethische Transformationsprozesse im frühen Christentum“) der „Frage nach dem spezifisch Christlichen oder nach dem Proprium der paulinischen Ethik“ (1) und der damit verbundenen Frage nach „Inklusivität“ und „Exklusivität“ des paulinischen Ethos nach: inwieweit Paulus Traditionen aus der jüdischen und griechisch-römischen Umwelt übernimmt und bloß in einen neuen Begründungszusammenhang stellt oder diese transformiert und materiaethisch innovativ wird. Dabei konzentriert sie sich „auf den großen Themenkomplex der Sexual- und Geschlechterrollenethik“ (1).

Im folgenden Überblick über den Forschungsstand zum paulinischen Ethos richtet Körner einen besonderen Fokus auf den (in mehreren seiner Veröffentlichungen dargelegten) Ansatz von Michael Wolter, welcher mit soziologischen Kategorien den funktionalen Aspekt des Zusammenhangs von Gruppenethos und -identität herausstellt. Während ein inklusives Ethos Positionen und Handlungsweisen z.B. der griechischen Mehrheitsgesellschaft integriert, um ein friedliches Zusammenzuleben zu ermöglichen und — einer inklusiven Ekklesiologie entsprechend — auch anschlussfähig zu sein für die unterschiedlichen Adressaten, hat ein exklusives Ethos die Funktion der Abgrenzung und Unterscheidung. Körner referiert die von Wolter gesehene Asymmetrie von exklusivem Identitätsanspruch und grundsätzlich inklusivem Ethos bei Paulus — mit Ausnahme seines jüdisch geprägten Sexualethos, wo sie ansetzt, um Inklusivität und Exklusivität kontextspezifisch zu differenzieren und nach dem zugrunde liegenden „theologische[n], Indikativ“ (18) zu fragen. Als „inklusiv“ wertet sie am Ende den übergreifenden Stellenwert sexualethischer Positionen in der Etablierung von Identität.

Eine theoretische Grundlegung zu Genderfragen (in Rezeption einschlägiger neutestamentlicher Forschungsarbeiten, auch zu Leiblichkeits- und Körperlichkeitsdiskursen), welche sich in einer dem Thema „Sexualität und Geschlecht“ gewidmeten Arbeit anbieten würde, wäre wünschenswert gewesen. Körner sieht in der Anwendung des Gender-Begriffs auf antike Konstellationen einen „Anachronismus“ (19), spricht freilich von „Geschlechterrollen“. Dabei zeigt etwa Daniel Boyarin (»Gender«, *Critical Terms for Religious Studies* [ed. M.C. Taylor] [Chicago 1998] 117-135) die Relevanz der Genderperspektive und ihre Dynamik gerade auch für den antiken Kontext auf, insofern sie unterschiedliche Konstruktionen von Geschlechterrollen erhellen kann.

Dem exegetischen Hauptteil wird ein knapper Überblick über „Die soziale und kulturelle Realität in der hellenistischen Umwelt der paulinischen Gemeinden“, was Ehe, „Inzest“, Prostitution, Frauen im öffentlichen Leben und Geschlechterrollensymbolik betrifft, vorangestellt (Kapitel II). Außerdem referiert Körner für einen zeitgeschichtlichen Vergleich mit literarischen Quellen (Kapitel III) exemplarisch je zwei Beispiele aus dem jüdischen (Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen, Pseudo-Phokylides) sowie griechisch-römischen Bereich (Musonius Rufus, Plutarch).

In Kapitel IV stellt Körner eine Analyse von Gal 3,23-29 voran unter dem Fragehorizont einer Aufhebung der Geschlechterunterschiede in Christus. Gemäß ihrem Anliegen, Paulus kritisch-differenzierend zwischen extremen Positionen einzuordnen und dabei insbesondere auch auf den Argumentationszusammenhang achtzugeben, lautet ihr Fazit: Paulus vertritt „nicht eine völlige Eliminierung der Unterschiede zwischen den Geschlechtern“ (105; 300: „Gleichwertigkeit ohne Gleichartigkeit“), aber auch keine bloße Gleichheit „coram Deo“ ohne ethische Konsequenzen. Sie verweist auf die „bleibend wichtige Rolle“ (105, 294) der Schöpfungserzählung für Paulus sowie „das charakteristische Zusammenwirken von Schöpfungstheologie, Christologie und Eschatologie“ (106, 295), in einer Spannung von mit Christus schon angebrochenem Neuen und noch ausstehender Erfüllung. Dies ist zugleich ein wesentlicher Interpretationshorizont für ihre folgenden exegetischen Ausführungen.

In „der ältesten paulinischen Paränese“ in 1 Thess 4,1-8 ortet sie mit der Warnung vor πορνεία in „Kopfposition“ (122) eine identitätsbestimmende sexualethische Forderung des Paulus im Kontext von Heiligkeitsvorstellungen, welche sich „in den gewohnten Bahnen seiner jüdischen Herkunftstradition“ (121) bewegt. Wenn Paulus „[m]it dem Begriffspaar ‚Unzucht‘ und ‚Habgier‘ [...] zwei jüdische Kardinalvorwürfe gegen die moralische Lasterhaftigkeit der ‚Heiden‘ auf[greift]“ (121, vgl. 116-117), ist freilich auch die stereotypisierte Rhetorik zu beachten, die nicht spiegelbildlich einer „sehr viel freizügiger[en]“ sozialgeschichtlichen Realität entsprechen *muss*, deren Veränderung „am gravierendsten“ und „am schwierigsten zu etablieren gewesen“ (119, vgl. 121) sei.

In besonderer Dichte finden sich Passagen zum Themenkomplex im ersten Brief an die Gemeinde in Korinth. Die Reihe der von Körner besprochenen Stellen eröffnet 1 Kor 5,1-13: Anhand eines konkreten Einzelfalls von „Unzucht“ mit der „Frau des Vaters“ (V. 1), wo Paulus in alttestamentlicher Tradition, zugleich christologisch begründet, rigoros den Ausschluss des Täters fordert, werden wiederum „Reinheit und Heiligkeit der Gesamtgemeinde“ (139) verhandelt, verbildlicht mit der „Passa-Metaphorik“ (139-140, vgl. 132) von — hier kontaminierendem — Sauerteig.

Ein ähnliches Ziel verfolgt die tempeltheologische Motivik in 1 Kor 6,12-20 in einer Verknüpfung von „christologisch-anthropologische[r]“ und „ekklesiologische[r] Argumentation“ (149): Der Leib „als Kommunikations- und Beziehungsorgan“ (156) ist gemäß der paulinischen $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ Χριστοῦ-Metaphorik nicht nur „Glied Christi“ (zu v. 15 vgl. 12,27), sondern auch „Tempel des Heiligen Geistes“ (v. 19; vgl. 3,16) und daher inkompatibel mit πορνεία (v. 13,18), ob hier von „Bordellbesuchen“ (151, 156, 162 und später passim) die Rede ist oder allgemeiner „jede Form illegitimen Geschlechtsverkehrs“ (154, vgl. 159) im Blick steht. Das Zitat aus Gen 2,24 in 1 Kor 6,16 (angewandt auf die Verbindung mit einer Prostituierten) dient „dem tragenden schöpfungstheologischen Argument“ (163) bei Paulus, während V. 14 mit der (leiblichen) Auferweckung eine „eschatologische Dimension“ (149, 163) in den komplexen Gedankengang einfließen lässt.

In 1 Korinther 7 geht Paulus, in Reaktion auf konkrete Anfragen aus Korinth infolge asketischer Tendenzen, auf die Themen Ehe sowie Ehescheidung ein, denen Körner jeweils ein Kapitel widmet. Bevorzugt Paulus die Ehelosigkeit, motiviert durch akute Naherwartung, gesteht er dennoch die Ehe „als einzig legitime[n] Ort für die Praktizierung der Sexualität“ (172) zu. Körner sieht den „alttestamentlich-jüdische[n] Schöpfungsglaube[n] indirekt auch hier im Hintergrund“ (174) mit einer komplementären Geschlechterrelation (der von Körner herausgestellte Ehezweck der Fortpflanzung findet sich jedoch stärker in der Rezeption, etwa durch Augustinus, als explizit in der biblischen Schöpfungserzählung selbst), ortet aber eine Korrektur durch „seine christologisch interpretierte Eschatologie“ (184-185; 1 Kor 7,8.26 „in einem direkten Widerspruch“ [184] zu Gen 2,18 LXX). In materialethischer Hinsicht weist sie im Blick auf das eheliche Sexualleben auf „erstaunlich egalitäre Aussagen“ (189) in jeweils reziproker Formulierung hin. Die „Konzession“ des Paulus in v. 6 bezieht sie „auf den zeitlich begrenzten Rückzug zum Gebet“ (180). — Ebenso sieht sie in der „Ehescheidung Frauen und Männer gleich behandelt“ (197, vgl. 214, 299). Für das von Paulus zum Scheidungsverbot herangezogene „Herrenwort“ (v. 10) referiert sie die synoptischen Versionen. Zur Frage, warum v. 10-11 zunächst von der Frau ausgehen, diskutiert sie die Scheidungsmöglichkeiten von Frauen im griechisch-römischen sowie jüdischen Bereich. Wenn sie dabei eine „Mainstream-Meinung“ im Judentum“ (196) postuliert und in weiterer Folge Paulus mehrfach abweichen lässt, hebt sie ihn tendenziell von einer konstruierten Hintergrundfolie ab, die es so zu belegen gilt. Auch in der Frage der „Mischehen“ (v. 12-16) gibt es differierende Stimmen bereits im AT. Hier habe für Paulus „das ihm überkommene Ehescheidungsverbot Jesu größeres Gewicht [...] als das ihm von seiner jüdischen Herkunftstradition vertraute Endogamiegebot mit den damit verbundenen Reinheits- und Heiligkeitsvorstellungen“ (202-203).

Der Zusammenhang von Sexualethik und sozialen Geschlechterrollen in ihren kulturellen Konstruktionen zeigt sich nach Körner im antiken Denken am deutlichsten am Beispiel der Homosexualität. Dazu beleuchtet sie die Ausführungen des Paulus in Röm 1,18-27 (innerhalb einer schöpfungstheologischen Argumentation zu verfehlteter Gotteserkenntnis, als negatives rhetorisches *exemplum*) und in 1 Kor 6,9-11 (im Rahmen eines „Lasterkatalogs“, in einem Einst-Jetzt-Schema mit der Taufe als Wendepunkt), woran sie Gedanken zu heutigem Umgang mit den zeit- und kontextbedingten Aussagen schließt.

Zur schöpfungstheologischen Begründung einer Geschlechterrollensymbolik im Gottesdienst in 1 Kor 11,2-16 referiert Körner die in der Forschung diskutierten Hauptlinien und folgt der Hypothese, dass Paulus eine „geordnete Haartracht fordert, bzw. umgekehrt, gegen deren Auflösen im Gottesdienst protestiert“ (251). Beim „unverhüllten Haupt“ bei einer Frau in v. 5 sind freilich die nur in Anmerkung genannten Parallelstellen bei Philo und Josephus stärker zu gewichten, in v. 15 dient das Haar als „natürliche“ *Analogie* für eine (textile) Hülle. Ebenso deutet das Beispiel der monumentalen Korinther Augustusstatue mit über den Kopf gezogener Toga auf einen zeitgeschichtlichen Hintergrund für die Schande bei einem Mann, der etwas „vom Kopf herab hat“ (siehe A. Taschl-Erber, »Genesis-Rezeption in 1 Kor 11,2-16: ‚die Frau‘ als ‚Abglanz des Mannes‘?«, *Menschenbilder und Gottesbilder. Geschlecht in theologischer Reflexion* [Hg. L.-C. Krannich – H. Reichel – D. Evers] [Leipzig 2019] 73-110). Wenn Körner in der Textuntersuchung mehrfach auf „die (früh)jüdische Auslegung(stradition)“ der Genesis rekurriert, hätte eine nähere Auseinandersetzung mit entsprechenden Quellentexten noch zur Erhellung beigetragen. Ob in v. 11 „im Herrn“ tatsächlich auf die Schöpfungsmittlerschaft Christi verweist?

Am Ende fragt Körner anhand von Röm 16,1-16 nach den „Frauen im Mitarbeiterkreis des Paulus“, um die Geschlechterrollenthematik abzurunden. In diesem keineswegs „in der Sekundärliteratur eher marginal behandelten Text“ (289-290) „erfährt der programmatische Grundsatz von Gal 3,28 von allen in dieser Untersuchung verhandelten Textpassagen der paulinischen Briefe wohl seine ‚vollständigste‘ praktische Realisierung“ (290), gerade in den „‚Kernanliegen‘ der frühchristlichen Bewegung“ (291), nämlich Verkündigungstätigkeit und Gestaltung des Gemeindelebens. Im Zuge der exegetischen Diskussion spricht Körner dabei κοινῶν eine technische Bedeutung ab (unter Berufung auf Hildegard Scherer; siehe hingegen S. Schreiber, »Arbeit mit der Gemeinde [Röm 16,6, 12]: Zur versunkenen Möglichkeit der Gemeindeleitung durch Frauen«, *NTS* 46 [2000] 204-226). Zu Junia wäre die Pionierarbeit von Bernadette J. Broton zu würdigen. — Wie Körner herausstellt, ist die aktive Beteiligung von Frauen „als selbstverständlich vorausgesetzt, ohne dass es dafür einer weiteren Rechtfertigung bedürfe“ (291). Im Spektrum der Handlungsmöglichkeiten und -spielräume für Frauen im hellenistisch-römischen Kulturraum lehnt sich Paulus nicht an den „‚konservativ-patriarchalischen‘ Strömungen“ an, „sondern eben an den ‚emanzipatorischen‘“ (291).

In den „Schlussbetrachtungen“ (Kapitel V) fasst Körner ihre Thesen kompakt und stringent zusammen. Neben dem Literaturverzeichnis runden Bibelstellen- sowie kurze Namens- und Sachregister die Arbeit ab.

Bei allem Bemühen um ein differenziertes Verständnis wäre im Sinne der *New Perspective on Paul* teils noch mehr Vorsicht in den konkreten Formulierungen wünschenswert (auch was die Tora betrifft in der Analyse des Galaterbriefs). Die dualistische Unterscheidung von „judenchristlich“ und „heidenchristlich“, obwohl die Terminologie bereits mehrfach problematisiert worden ist, geht von zu festen Kategorien und homogenen Identitäten aus — auch im Verhältnis von „jüdisch“ und „judenchristlich“: Hier wäre die Prozesshaftigkeit und Fluidität neutestamentlicher Identitätsdiskurse stärker zu berücksichtigen. Stellenweise klingt die Argumentation zu pauschalierend, wenn etwa die Sexualethik „bei Paulus an vielen Stellen traditionell jüdisch geprägt (und das heißt dann im Hinblick auf das Geschlechterverhältnis eben auch ziemlich ‚patriarchalisch‘ ausgerichtet)“ (16) beschrieben wird.

Mancherorts hätte die Arbeit noch profitiert von einer vertieften (originalsprachlichen) Auseinandersetzung mit frühjüdischen und römisch-hellenistischen Quellen sowie der Diskussion weiterer einschlägiger Sekundärliteratur. Wie eine gendertheoretische Fundierung des Themas scheint auch feministische Paulus-Exegese teilweise ausgeblendet (gerade im deutschsprachigen Raum wären z.B. Angela Standhartinger, Claudia Janssen oder Luise Schottroff zu nennen, welche auch einen Kommentar zum ersten Korintherbrief verfasst hat).

Insgesamt aber präsentiert Körner eine fundierte Exegese, die gängige Forschungsdiskurse in differenzierender Argumentation diskutiert und Einseitigkeiten zu vermeiden versucht. Das Verdienst ihrer Dissertation liegt insbesondere in der Zusammenschau der relevanten paulinischen Texte, wobei sie eigene Akzentsetzungen verfolgt (etwa auch im Vergleich zur zeitgleich erschienenen Monographie von A. Wucherpfennig, *Sexualität bei Paulus* [Freiburg i. Br. 2020]).

Mayerweckstraße, 1
A-1210 Wien
andrea.taschl-erber@kphvie.ac.at

Andrea TASCHL-ERBER

Varia

Daniel M. GURTNER, *Introducing the Pseudepigrapha of Second Temple Judaism*. Message, Context, and Significance. Grand Rapids, MI, Baker Academic, 2020. xix-456 p. 16 × 23.5. \$49.99

Following closely on the heels of the outstanding encyclopedia that the author edited with L.T. Stuckenbruck (*T & T Clark Encyclopedia of Second Temple Judaism* [London 2019]), this volume provides a learned introduction to an emblematic cross section of ancient Jewish or Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. The book is dedicated to his coeditor Stuckenbruck, who for his part pens an appreciative foreword. To be sure, Gurtner recognizes that pseudepigraphy (“falsely attributed writing”) is an inherently unstable and unwieldy rubric. In his own words, it is a “classification of omission” or catchall category that captures what these texts are *not* rather than what they are, though he finds no better terminology or solution at hand (2).

As with any survey or anthology of Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, the corpus of works corralled between these covers is somewhat arbitrary and could easily be expanded or contracted, since it is neither attested in any manuscript nor enshrined in any canon. Compared to the wide net cast in his encyclopedia, Gurtner considerably narrows his sights in this introduction. On the one hand, he excludes biblical texts, at least those that fall within the Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish canons, but includes some works held to be canonical in certain Orthodox churches (and among Ethiopian Jewry) such as *Psalms 151*, *Jubilees*, *1 Enoch*, and *4 Ezra*. The book is explicitly put forward as a complement to the earlier volume of D.A. de Silva, *Introducing the Apocrypha* (Grand Rapids, MI 2002),

which bore a similar title and came off the same press. In the preface, the author pledges to deliberately sidestep the apocryphal or deuterocanonical literature that de Silva covered “with the exception of a single item (Ps. 151)” (xiii), though that is not strictly on the mark, insofar as there is additional overlap in the case of *4 Ezra* (cf. de Silva, *Introducing*, 323-351).

As the title suggests, this volume aims to survey discernibly Jewish pseudepigraphal literature composed during the Second Temple period, and further seeks “to provide sufficient dialogue on critical issues in scholarly discourse” so as to equip nonspecialists with the tools and context to appreciate these writings and handle them responsibly (xii). The temporal frame is extended beyond the lifespan of the Second Temple to encompass the decades after its destruction, setting an upper limit at roughly the time of the Bar Kokhba revolt (132-135 CE). The task of dating ancient texts is fraught, to say the least, and perhaps surpassed in complexity only by the challenge of disentangling Jewish materials that are preserved primarily in Christian manuscripts and libraries, yet these serve as the twin canonical pillars that ground and delimit this project.

The introduction (1-17) outlines the rationale and basic orientation of the work. Gurtner rightly laments how the pseudepigraphic label gives rise to anachronistic misconceptions, since the notion of “false” authorship evokes modern qualms over attribution and authenticity while the category itself implies a degree of coherence or canonicity that is illusory for this period. He offers some helpful rejoinders in defense of the practice of pseudepigraphy, but, in the latter case, Gurtner perhaps perpetuates the confusion by retaining the definite article in his title rather than following the lead of Bauckham and Davila in this regard (R. Bauckham – J.R. Davila, “Introduction”, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. More Noncanonical Scriptures. Vol. 1 [eds. R. Bauckham – J.R. Davila – A. Panayotov] [Grand Rapids, MI 2013] xxvii). The author adequately attends to the cognate literature that falls outside the domain of this study as well as to the patchy history of modern scholarship before situating his own approach and organization of the material in dialogue with his predecessors.

Gurtner rejects an alphabetical or chronological ordering of the texts as impractical and instead favors a system based on genre, hewing closely to the taxonomy and even subdivisions that Charlesworth proposed in his anthology, albeit with some minor improvements (e.g., he moves the apocalyptically stamped *Testament of Abraham* out of the class of “Testaments”, notwithstanding the title, in line with its closer affinity to the genre of apocalypse) and rearrangements (e.g., he combines Charlesworth’s subdivisions “Wisdom and Philosophical Literature” and “Prayers, Psalms, and Odes” into a single category: “Psalms, Wisdom Literature, and Prayers”). The body of the work is divided into four sections. The catalogue of texts is not meant to be exhaustive but representative of the various genres, at least within the temporal/genetic parameters of the work. Each section begins with a brief overview of the genre(s) that traces its biblical and pseudepigraphic profile and concludes with an appendix of additional writings that receive shorter shrift on account of their dubious provenance/dating, relative obscurity, or other defects.

The first and longest section (19-163) deals with “Apocalypses” and devotes almost half of its pages (21-91) to the composite work known as *1 Enoch*. This is a fine contribution that deftly treats not only the whole but each of its constituent parts (*Book of Watchers*, *Book of Parables*, etc.) and even subunits (*Dream*

Visions, Animal Apocalypse, etc.) in some depth, canvassing introductory matters, language of composition and manuscript traditions, provenance, dating, contents, various critical or theological issues, purpose, and finally reception history. The author covers roughly the same ground for each of the primary texts under consideration in the volume, though *1 Enoch* attracts more comprehensive treatment than other works whose pedigree is questionable. Thus, in this section *4 Ezra* is mooted apart from its Christianized frame in *2 Esdras* and only the ostensibly older Jewish *Sibylline Oracles* of chapters 3–5 and chapter 11 make the final cut. The post-70 apocalypses *2 Baruch* and the *Apocalypse of Abraham* round out the picture followed by an appendix that includes further elaborations from some of the same figures (*2 Enoch*, *3 Baruch*, *Apocalypse of Zephaniah*, *Testament of Abraham*, and sundry apocalyptic material from the Dead Sea Scrolls).

The second and third sections concern “Testaments and Related Texts” (165–222) and “Legends and Expansions of Biblical Traditions” (223–330), respectively. The former highlights the final words ascribed to the great prophet (*Testament of Moses*) and the long-suffering sage Job/Jobab (*Testament of Job*), concluding with the Levitical “priestly trilogy of Qumran”, i.e., *Aramaic Levi Document*, *Testament of Qahat*, and *Visions of Amram* (195). Some readers may be disappointed to find the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* relegated to the appendix, though its Christian overlay is no secret. Other works that join the patriarchs in the back include the genre-bending *Testament of Solomon* and Qumranic *Testament of Naphtali* (4Q215), along with a few other fragmentary scrolls from the caves. As for the legends and expansions, these texts are somehow connected with traditions about Israel’s past, which they expand or reconfigure in different ways. This section encompasses stalwarts of the phenomenon of “rewritten Scripture” such as *Jubilees*, Pseudo-Philo’s *Biblical Antiquities*, and the *Genesis Apocryphon*, which despite the theological nuances or innovations that they introduce via variation or omission, nonetheless roughly follow the contours of the biblical narratives that are recast. Following the terminological distinction of Crawford, *Joseph and Aseneth* stands in for “parabiblical” literature that takes more liberties in spinning off tales that are only tangentially rooted in Scripture. Stretching the genre near its breaking point, the singular *Letter of Aristeas*, which purports to proffer a myth of origins for the LXX translation, also earns a place at the table. The appendix boasts one genuinely “non-pseudepigraphal” work in the etymological sense, i.e., Ezekiel the Tragedian’s play *Exagoge*, in addition to the parabiblical *Life of Adam and Eve* and *4 Baruch*.

The fourth section on “Psalms, Wisdom Literature, and Prayers” (331–372) is comprised of only three entries, including some songs put in the mouth of King David and his son, i.e., *Psalms 151–155* and *Psalms of Solomon*, as well as an ethically-oriented wisdom poem, *The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides*. There are almost no pseudepigraphal Jewish prayers from this period that survive outside of larger works, though the appendix contains a few examples that are either of later provenance, such as the *Hellenistic Synagogal Prayers*, or fragmentary, e.g., the Qumranic *Prayer of Nabonidus* (2Q242) and the *Prayer of Joseph* that Origen cites. The book closes with a conclusion (373–383) that casts a backward glance over the road just travelled and a bibliography that is cumulative rather than divided by text or genre. Lastly, there are indices for authors, biblical references, and ancient writings.

This volume serves as a reliable guide to the sprawling topography of ancient Jewish Pseudepigrapha, presenting on balance a judicious overview of the critical debates that these texts have provoked. It will prove a valuable resource for courses in ancient Judaism and related subjects. More specifically, it is highly recommended to those interested in tracking the theological and exegetical cross-currents within Second Temple literature or keen to probe the Jewish matrix of the New Testament.

To be sure, in a work as wide-ranging as this introduction, the coverage of some areas is perhaps inevitably uneven. The author brings his own expertise to bear whenever relevant, and on certain questions his insight helpfully illumines the discussion (e.g., the dating of 2 *Baruch*, 109; cf. D.M. Gurtner, "The 'Twenty-Fifth Year of Jeconiah' and the Date of 2 *Baruch*", *JSP* 18 [2008] 23-32). It is comprehensible that he leans heavily on favored commentators to navigate parts of the terrain (VanderKam on *Jubilees*, Collins on apocalyptic literature, etc.), though at times the author seems to adopt an overly deferential tone that summarizes a range of scholarly views yet muffles his own critical voice. Consequently, the reader is forced to divine the rationale behind the author's choices, and sometimes is left with the misleading impression that victory in debate belongs to the last opinion aired, as it were by default. Specialists are bound to dispute some claims or decisions in this volume and may further question the underlying methodology and criteria for inclusion (e.g., why not revisit the *Prayer of Manasseh*, which would fill a lacuna?). Notwithstanding these caveats, Gurtner's work is a welcome contribution to pseudepigraphal studies that issues an eloquent appeal to study and appreciate these writings "in their own rights and contexts" (xii).

Via della Pilotta 25
I-00187 Rome

Joseph P. RIORDAN, SJ